

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. XIX

Spring Number, 1950

No. 2

EDITORIAL BOARD

NOLAN B. HARMON, *Editor-in-Chief*

ERMINIE HUNTRESS LANTERO, *Assistant Editor*

JOHN BAILLIE	CLARENCE T. CRAIG	KENNETH S. LATOURETTE
ROBBINS W. BARSTOW	LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	G. ASHTON OLDHAM
SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT	JOHN KNOX	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
GERALD R. CRAGG		PAUL E. SCHERER

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Joseph Haroutunian	Harold C. Phillips	D. Elton Trueblood
Paul Bentley Kern	Richard Campbell Raines	Leslie D. Weatherhead
Earl Bowman Marlatt	Edward T. Ramsdell	Theodore O. Wedel
W. E. McCulloch	Carl C. Rasmussen	Luther A. Weigle
Robert Hastings Nichols		R. Frederick West

CONTENTS

	PAGE
"Christ's Victory and Ours".....	Frederick C. Grant 162
The Conquest of Pain.....	James W. Wilson 163
Christian Education After Ten Years of Ecumenical Thinking,	
E. G. Homrighausen	176
The Community of Immortals.....	C. Lewis Robson 186
A Second Look at Toynbee.....	David Wesley Soper 192
Mr. Schlesinger's <i>Vital Center</i>	Sydney E. Ahlstrom 205
"When Saw We Thee in Prison?".....	Robert A. Preston 213
Was Goethe a Christian?.....	Mims Thornburgh Workman 224
Evangelizing the Whole of Life.....	Gerald O. McCulloh 236
The Intimate Journal of an Old-time Humanist.....	John Paterson 245
A New Literary Hero.....	Robert W. Lynn 255
What Is Good Church Music?.....	Allan Bacon 264
Charles Haddon Spurgeon—An Appreciation.....	John Pitts 273
The Essence of Christianity—Brotherhood.....	J. Quinter Miller 281
A Review of the Quarter's Fiction.....	John C. Schroeder 287
Book Reviews.....	292

Copyright, 1950, by Pierce and Smith. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

Published by

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS

150 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

"Christ's Victory and Ours"

FREDERICK C. GRANT

CHRIST upon his cross can change all of life for us, if we will let him do so. In the last analysis, and viewed in the light of God's purposes, Jesus died in order to do that. His was no isolated death; every cry of anguish of every martyr since history began was in that crying silence of his long hours on Calvary. He died, we say, in order to reconcile us with God, and give us this same victorious new life. That is more than metaphor or poetry or figure of speech. It is the most real thing in man's experience. Let us not be content, then, merely to accept the doctrine, but let us press on to learn the secret of this victorious life which, far from being vanquished by death, shone out with greater glory and vigor upon the cross than ever before, more gloriously even than upon the Mount of Transfiguration.

—*Christ's Victory and Ours*, by Frederick C. Grant. The Macmillan Company, 1950, pp. 18-19. Used by permission.

RELIGION IN LIFE is published quarterly by Abingdon-Cokesbury Press at 75 cents per copy. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year, \$5.00 for three years in the United States and possessions and Mexico; Canada, postage 18 cents per year additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents per year additional. For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by the Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E. C. 1, at the rate of nine shillings and sixpence per year.

Publication office, 810 Broadway, Nashville 2, Tennessee. Editorial office, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York. Entered as Second Class Matter, August 26, 1942, at the post office in Nashville, Tennessee, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized March 16, 1923.

The Conquest of Pain

JAMES W. WILSON

PAIN IS AS OLD as sentient existence. It was here on earth ages before the appearance of man. As soon as life on the subhuman level acquired a nervous system sufficiently developed to experience it, so soon did suffering enter into life; and the suffering has increased in range and intensity as the nervous system developed. When man arrived on earth, suffering of mind was added to pain of body. Only human beings are subject to the keen pangs of mental and moral and spiritual life; only human beings know the meaning of heartache and heartbreak, the awfulness of remorse and the bitterness of scalding tears. Through the ages of man's existence, pain has acted as a stern tutor for his moral training and development, as it has ever been a constant means of physical training in the animal world, serving as a warning of danger or a spur to activity.

Pain, of some kind and measure, is world-wide in extent and perhaps all-inclusive in the number of its sufferers. Sooner or later, the lot of nearly every man is to know suffering in some degree in his own experience. Of course, we can make the fact of pain seem more difficult than it really is by indulging in vague talk about the "unimaginable sum of human misery." The mere number of sufferers, or the sad total of the hours of pain endured, do not make the fact itself more certain nor does it lessen its mystery. The fact of pain imposes the problem of pain. And that problem demands that we face it honestly and answer it to the best of our ability.

I. GOD AND THE PROBLEM OF PAIN

The problem of pain is first of all the problem of the character of God. That is what makes it so profound and so compelling. If we cannot explain it fully, or even satisfactorily, neither can we dodge it or treat it lightly.

Multitudes of Christians have been puzzled and dejected as they became aware of the tragic difference between the Gospel picture of a Christlike, fatherly God and the agelong experience of the pain-wracked masses of mankind. The mere existence of pain seems to be an indictment

JAMES W. WILSON, B.D., D.D., was formerly minister of the Mt. Kisco Methodist Church, Mt. Kisco, N. Y. His purpose in this article is to seek the Christian meaning and use of pain through a personal experience.

of God's intelligence and power. How can he be all-seeing and all-wise, and yet be the Creator of this kind of world? Or how can he be all-powerful and yet allow the pitiful pain of mankind to continue? As C. S. Lewis reminds us, Christianity, in a sense, "creates, rather than solves the problem of pain, for pain would be no problem, unless, side by side with our daily experience of this painful world, we had received what we think a good assurance that ultimate reality is righteous and loving."¹

Only as we affirm a Christlike, fatherly God do we have to wrestle with this problem of pain. If God were merely the "Judge of all the earth," the problem of pain would not arise because all the sufferings of man might then be reckoned as simply what sinners deserve. If God's relation to us were merely that of Creator, there would be no necessary problem of pain, because it would have been simply an ordained part of existence since the world began, with no relation to his character or purpose. If God were merely the Ruler of the universe, there would be no necessary problem of pain, because as absolute Sovereign he could do as he pleased regardless of justice and mercy and love. But if God is indeed our heavenly Father, if he is infinitely loving and righteous, if he is a God who knows and cares and shares, if he is still in control of this world and Lord of all its life—then we must seek to reconcile our estimate of his character with our knowledge of the fierceness of man's suffering. An all-knowing and all-powerful God does not create the problem of pain; but the Christian gospel of an all-loving God hurls a pain problem at every believer.

No progress toward a solution is possible until we make up our minds as to the character of God. The kind of God we really believe in, and are willing and determined to live and die with, will decide the kind of solution we seek or accept. Our sorely tried Christian faith still insists that the very source of the problem is also the source of the solution; that no one but the fatherly God of Jesus can resolve the problem of pain and make suffering endurable and fruitful for life. We cannot prove it, but we do believe. And that belief saves our sanity and comforts us in our distress.

The problem of pain is also the problem of God's providence. Is he really as beneficent as we have pictured him? Does he really care for each individual sufferer? How can he stand it to see all the suffering of all men in all ages, and not do something directly and immediately about it? Goethe said, "If I were God, this world of sin and suffering would

¹ C. S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain*. The Macmillan Company, 1944, p. 93.

break my heart." When Omar Khayyam saw the pain and misery of mankind, he longed

To grasp this sorry Scheme of Things entire,
 shatter it to bits—and then
 Remold it nearer to the Heart's desire!

How many of us have longed to do the same thing!

But do we really want a world with the possibility of suffering left out? Could God have achieved his own higher purposes for man if he had made a universe from which the possibility of pain was excluded? If we could misbehave as we pleased, without any suffering as the inevitable consequence, how long would the highest types of character survive? Suffering is here on earth not by accident, nor as God's "second thought," but because without it God could not produce a man worthy and capable of divine sonship. God is, therefore, responsible for the fact that suffering is possible, but man is to blame if he turns this possibility into actuality. That does not mean that each specific pain is the direct and just penalty for some specific misdeed of the specified individual who suffers. It may mean that the human perversity of the race is to blame for much of the undeserved suffering of the individual.

Suffering is not an external imposition by an easily offended God, but is an integral part of life itself. "The capacity for pain enters into the very structure of consciousness, and is an indispensable element in our equipment for life. The higher the development, the greater the capacity, and the more important the function of pain."² We do well to recognize that the measure of this capacity for pain is also the measure of our capacity for pleasure. As men have risen to higher levels of consciousness, they have achieved a greater capacity both for pain and for pleasure. The Providence of God, therefore, has given to us the possibility of life's most awful suffering and its most rapturous bliss. And, we believe, he has left to the human family the power to choose which shall prevail in increasing measure both for the individual and for the whole human race.

The problem of pain is also the problem of the Sovereignty of God. You may remember J. S. Mill's famous dilemma: either God is good but not powerful, or else he is powerful but not good. If he were powerful enough and good enough, he would surely banish suffering from his realm. The fact that he does not do so is proof that he has to allow it, that he cannot help it, or else he is not good! The most hopeful clue to an answer seems to be that God is limited, but only by limitations he places on his

² W. A. Brown, *Christian Theology in Outline*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912, p. 206.

own sovereignty; that from the moment he bestowed on man the power of choice he had to permit man to make those wrong choices which resulted in pain and evil for the human race. So pain and evil are here not because of any inherent limitation in God's sovereignty or defect in his goodness, but because of man's willful and disastrous wrong choices. His sovereignty, then, is self-limited to the degree that he has endowed man with the power to choose good or evil. Beyond this self-limitation his sovereignty is absolute.

II. PAIN AS A PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

So many people who talk glibly and protractedly about pain know little or nothing about it as an experience. Looking at pain from the outside leads to the facile and shallow solutions we have heard so often, but looking at pain from the inside makes a man very humble and reticent. He knows it as a bitter, and often defeating, personal experience. He knows that reason alone cannot plumb the depths of the problem nor offer any adequate solution. He realizes that in the last analysis, the answer too must spring out of experience. It must come by way of a Gethsemane and a Calvary. The spectator of pain may think that intellect can solve the problem; the experiencer of pain knows better. The problem never seems very acute or pressing until suffering comes to our own life.

For seven long, dreary, and dreadful years I have been the victim of one of the most painful and crippling diseases known to man, rheumatoid arthritis. The disease has been progressive, attacking more and more joints. The first attack put me in a medical center where they even had to feed me. How many acute attacks have followed at varying time-intervals I cannot say. But there has been hardly a minute during the past seven years when there was no pain at all, and most of the time there was a nagging, gnawing pain.

The most terrible attack occurred in December, 1947. There was no previous warning and probably no way to prevent its onslaught. The attack centered in the spine at the back of my neck. It came with lightning speed, but it did not leave that way. For three days and nights I rolled all over my bed, unable to lie or sit in any position longer than a moment at a time. For three weeks I thought that either my mind would become unbalanced, or death would bring me welcome relief. Never had I dreamed that such torture could come to any human being. How I survived, or why, and how I retained my sanity—only the grace and goodness

of G
sickro
mean
faith
the a
memo
But t
only

unbel
about
to wh
observ
of pai

sent f
of the
rectly
suffer
natur
huma
ment
true.

it is
folly,
lead
put G
year?
fering

guara
place

³ In
suffering
either o

⁴ W
p. 516.

of God can account for that. It was over six months before I left my sickroom to go downstairs for my meals, and later, to go out of doors.

How did I react to that extreme attack? What helps and ways and means did I use to enable my spirit to endure? to hold on to my religious faith? to keep on trusting God? Frankly, I do not know what I did when the agony was at its worst. Temporarily I lost normal consciousness. My memory of quite a bit of what happened has already passed into oblivion. But this I do remember: hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of times my only prayer was, "God, have mercy upon me."

When the attack was at its worst, there were plenty of black and unbelieving moments. Many times there raced through my mind doubts about the goodness of God and even his very existence; the conclusions to which I came were not easily won. Theories may be acceptable to the observer of pain; but only real answers can be tolerated by the experiencer of pain.

III. THE PURPOSE OF PAIN

It is easy to believe that some pain is retributive, which means it is sent from God as the natural result and the just punishment for the sins of the sufferer. We no longer think of this punishment as inflicted directly and personally by God, measuring out specific pains to specific sufferers on the basis of specific sins. Rather, the pain comes via the natural order and fixed laws of life as the inescapable consequence of human misbehavior. But in both cases the ultimate sender of the punishment is God; and in both cases sin results in suffering. And that is always true. Someone, somewhere, sometime must suffer for every sin of man.³

That the wicked should suffer seems natural and reasonable. In fact, it is easy to understand why most people suffer—their own ignorance, folly, and sin sufficiently account for it. But what about the many who lead exemplary lives, cherish high ideals, love goodness, fight evil, and put God's will first—and yet are afflicted and tortured by pain year after year? "The real problem of life is not suffering, but undeserved suffering."⁴

Dr. A. C. Knudson thinks that the very character of God himself guarantees that the suffering of the righteous has a worthy meaning and place in the divine plan. Observing the wisdom and love of God in nature

³ In the case of the man born blind, Jesus stressed the truth that wherever there is sin there will be suffering, but that you cannot conclude that wherever there is affliction it is the consequence of specific sins, either on the part of the sufferer or his parents. Cf. John 9:1-3.

⁴ Will Durant, *Our Oriental Heritage*, (Vol. I, *The Story of Civilization*). Simon & Schuster, 1935, p. 516.

as a whole, we are warranted in believing that our own afflictions are not purposeless. We may not understand God's purpose, but we can trust his love. Wherefore,

Let us be patient; these severe afflictions
Not from the ground arise,
But oftentimes celestial benedictions
Assume this dark disguise.⁵

Pain is not only retributive; it can be educative. It is a possible means of divine training. If we must learn some life lessons by our mistakes, then God must allow us to make those mistakes, even when he knows they will result in suffering. There must be no magical divine intervention to prevent the suffering, or there will be no lesson learned. When pain functions as an instrument of God used for our good, it teaches the teachable some of life's profoundest lessons in character and service. But, "suffering is not good in itself. What is good in any painful experience is, for the sufferer, his submission to the will of God, and for the spectators, the compassion aroused and the acts of mercy to which it leads."⁶

To all who accept it in the right spirit, and use it as he intended us to, pain can become a means of transformation and redemption. The finest men and women have recognized the part played by suffering in the making of noble character and the achievement of human usefulness. "In the story of the great, one chapter is invariably entitled 'Pain.'"⁷ Pain is one of God's hardest-to-accept means of transforming and redeeming a human life. But it is imperative, not optional, if we are to grow into the likeness of the Man of Galilee. Our sufferings must continue until God sees us transformed, or sees that we will never permit the transformation.

Apparently, God cannot lessen the pains of life without lowering its ideals and impoverishing the soul. A God who would free us, or exempt us, from all trials and tribulations would do us infinitely more harm than good. What many people seem to want is "not so much a Father in heaven as a grandfather in heaven," some senile benefactor whose chief anxiety is to see the young enjoy themselves, and whose plan for the universe is simply that it may be said at the end of each day, "a good time was had by all." It is a trite but true saying that "God whispers to us in our pleasures, speaks in our conscience, but shouts in our pains." And blessed are they who listen and learn!

⁵ D. O. Mears, *Inspired Through Suffering*. Fleming H. Revell Co., 1895, p. 75.

⁶ C. S. Lewis, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

⁷ René Fülöp-Miller, *Triumph Over Pain*. Garden City: Blue Ribbon Books, p. 3.

Even Jesus had to reach his perfection by way of suffering (cf. Heb. 2:10). "The Agony in the Garden and the terrors of the Death on the Cross were but the last scenes in the drama of his humiliation. Nor must the intensity of his physical sufferings blind us to the reality of the woes of his spirit. With his Divine sensitiveness to selfishness and disobedience and half-heartedness and unresponsiveness and sin, how poignant must have been the griefs which his sinless soul endured! For this 'Man of Sorrows, acquainted with grief,' every day must have been one of crucifixion."⁸ Jesus learned perfectly all that the right use of suffering can teach us. And he offers to reveal that knowledge to anyone who is willing to share his suffering and live his kind of life. He is the supreme teacher of the sublime truth that vicarious suffering is the secret of transforming pain into a tremendous power for good.

IV. PAIN AS EVIL

Some pain seems to be meaningless. Some pain seems to be useless. Some pain seems to be positively wicked.

What about the innocent little children diseased and deformed and racked by agonizing pain? If there is anything in the world that would excuse a man from believing in a good God, it is the spectacle of innocent childhood suffering the tortures of the damned. The sight of suffering adults who lead righteous lives may shake our faith; the sight of suffering children who have done no evil is apt to destroy our faith.

The most helpful hint in relation to this problem of innocent suffering, whether child or adult, comes from Dr. Weatherhead. He says that when God created the world, he had to choose between two possible bases, the individual and the family.

By the individual basis, I mean an arrangement of life by which we should never suffer save through some fault of our own and never benefit save by our own abilities. By the family basis I mean that we suffer for the sins, faults, ignorance, folly and so on of the great human family—the whole race. But also we gain by the merits of the family and our lives are enriched by the family brains and character and achievements.

. . . Suppose you fell ill through your own fault. No wisdom would be at your disposal save your own; no kindly sympathy or nursing; no invention of other men's brains; no skill of other men's fingers. What happens today? You are whirled to a hospital in a car which in itself represents the brains of a thousand men through a long period of years. At the hospital you are tended by the patient skill and nursing of others. Inventions and discoveries of brilliant men of all nations and all ages are at your disposal through the training the doctor has had.

⁸ Charles W. Rishell in *Hastings Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, II, 681-2.

In a word, the brains and skill of the whole family are at your beck and call. On the individual basis, you would have died like a dog in a ditch.

To enter a family is not only to take over the family assets, but the liabilities; not only the family joys but the family sorrows. I need not rack my soul with the torturing thought that my illness and pain are my fault. I may be suffering for the family. I may be one of those of whom Carlyle wrote: "For *us* was thy back bent; for *us* were thy straight limbs and fingers so deformed; thou wert *our* conscript on whom the lot fell, and fighting *our* battles was so marred." If a football team makes a mistake in tactics and in the effort to redeem the mistake one of the players is hurt, does he cry out against it as unjust? Does he ask why the innocent should suffer? No, he accepts it as part of the game. He is helping his team to win through. Let any sufferer just take that in. In ways he cannot yet see he is helping the team to win through.

So I think we must accept the basis of the family as the best of all possible bases. We must see that from the family we gain far more than we lose. We must beware lest by our own folly or sin, we leave a legacy of pain to those who follow later. God cannot prevent the suffering of the innocent without altering the whole basis of human life and rearranging it on a plan which would be far less good than the present one.⁹

It is the family, then, and not the individual which is responsible for so much of the suffering of the innocent. We cannot separate family risks and liabilities and woes from its benefits and blessings. We must accept both or reject both.

But alas, all too often, suffering whether deserved or undeserved seems to leave a man worse than it found him. Instead of pain being an invariable purifier, transformer, and ennobler there are plenty of cases where it seems to be a depressing, degrading, and degenerating force. Too much suffering, or suffering which increases beyond a certain intensity, may cause loss of religious faith, and doubt or denial of the very existence of a good God. Let us go slow in condemning those sufferers who, because of terrible pain, renounce religion, refuse to believe in a good God, and ask no boon of the Infinite except a quick release from their hell of torment. When the body becomes a torture chamber, then death may be a welcome deliverer.

There is a limit to human endurance. The spirit of man *can* be broken. The crushing of a human heart happens too often to need any proof beyond our own observation and experience. Pain can twist and deform a sensitive mind and soul as surely as it does a human body. The awfulness of such a result is beyond description, and it may be beyond remedy. Suffering can cause pitiful physical deformities. It can leave bitter memories in the mind. And it can sear ugly scars upon the soul.

⁹ Leslie D. Weatherhead, *The Mystery of Pain*. "The Upper Room," Nashville, Tenn., 1946, pp. 9-13.

It is terrifying to hear Dr. R. Havard testify that in some cases of chronic and extreme pain there occurs an actual gradual deterioration and disintegration of personality.¹⁰ When that happens we are forced to think of pain as wicked. It goes far beyond pain as retribution or discipline. It has in it no slightest trace of redemption.

The evil of pain depends upon its degree and duration. Pains below a certain intensity and short of a certain limit of time are not greatly resented by any reasonable man. Moderate pains of limited duration do not engender bitterness or rebellion or despair. Most of us have sense enough to expect in this kind of world a certain amount of pain of reasonable duration and severity. It is the long continued pain, the excruciating and agonizing pain, which becomes exhausting and disintegrating—and therefore wicked. When this happens to some pitifully stricken sufferer, then, at that point, the problem of pain merges with the problem of evil, and we must join God in fighting pain as a part of the kingdom of evil.

V. THE CONQUEST OF PAIN

Whether my own experience can be called a real conquest of pain is not for me to say. I might have learned much more from my terrible experience if I had been more teachable, and if there had been more and deeper trust in God. I am no hero when it comes to bearing pain bravely and fruitfully. But I did learn that God alone can hold us steady and true in these terrible moments. Also, that there may be a total eclipse, a complete blackout of religious faith and trust while the pain tortures us. But this, too, passes away, or is swallowed up in a deeper experience of God and greater willingness to trust where we cannot see or understand. I learned that "when pain is to be borne, a little courage helps more than much knowledge, a little sympathy more than much courage, and the least tincture of the love of God more than all."¹¹ I learned also that when we leave out God we are helpless and hopeless, and the world becomes a madhouse of chaos and destruction. If we cling to God, pain is no longer a senseless experience. It is more than a mere concomitant of the evolutionary process. It has a greater role to play than merely to serve as an instrument for the infliction of divine punishment. Suffering may become a chief opportunity for the sublimation of human life; an open door inviting us to a richer and more rewarding fellowship with him who was perfected through suffering.

¹⁰ C. S. Lewis, *op. cit.*, p. 143f.

¹¹ C. S. Lewis, *Ibid.*, p. viii.

Some believers who are great sufferers assert that they never have any religious doubts or moments of gloom or questionings about a good God and a loving Providence. I am not of their number. I have to fight for my faith and struggle to preserve my trust in the good God. One thing I know—I have come through awful pain and still believe and trust in my Lord. And sometime, somewhere, I expect to learn the "why" of pain and its uneven distribution among men. Until that hour, I shall try to "trust and obey."

Pessimists declare that pain will reign so long as there is any sentient existence, and will not be appreciably alleviated even through science; that the widespread and intense sufferings of people prove the world to be an intolerable place to live in, and life itself an unendurable burden. With Buddha and Schopenhauer, they find the only cure for suffering in "the cessation of desire, the abandonment of the will to live." Since existence and suffering are one, and since evil and desire are identical, the one sure way to escape suffering and evil is to cease to be, to quit living, or to become as desireless as a vegetable.

The Stoic is as helpless as the pessimist when confronted by the problem of pain. The best he can offer us is a lofty indifference to suffering, and a refusal to let it disturb his inner calm. However real and acute the pain may be, the wise and strong man will treat it indifferently, never allowing it to upset him in any way. There are very few human beings capable of maintaining such an impersonal and unfeeling attitude toward acute or prolonged pain. Of course, your Stoic never hesitated to commit suicide when life got too tough for him. But that can hardly be considered a happy solution.

The thoughtful optimist, on the other hand, values goodness above painlessness and holiness above happiness. He believes the highest good of man is moral, and that moral good can be attained only through discipline and suffering. "A world which made goodness easy would make true goodness impossible." Pain, therefore, is here for the good of man; it is both an opportunity and an instrument. Without suffering, man could not reach his best. "For the first time in history," says Dr. Carrel, "humanity, helped by science, has become master of its destiny. . . . To progress again, man must remake himself. And he cannot remake himself without suffering."¹²

But the final verdict of human experience is that Christianity alone

¹² Alexis Carrel, *Man the Unknown*. Harper & Brothers, 1935, p. 274.

has
find
whe
life
heal
can
ness
vicar
pain
we
sent
simp
but
what
inher
cann

many
stre
A fri
a lad
man
despa
to G
richer
and s

divine
ing.
but ev
battle
a God
soul f
by the
allow
in the
yet p

has the key to the mystery of pain and the mastery of suffering. We must find our answer in a vital personal experience with God. And that is where Jesus found his answer. To admit the infinite God into your whole life and to have him dwell there is to share a fellowship of love which will heal earth's sufferings and sorrows. Only through such an experience can we see our sufferings as a trial of our faith, and a test of our righteousness. And see, also, that in the providence of God our pains may be vicarious and redemptive. Only through such an experience can we rob pain of its power to do us harm. Only through such an experience can we escape the natural result of suffering, which is not saintliness but resentment, bitterness, rebellion, and despair. For no man becomes a saint simply because he suffers; saintliness is attained not because of suffering but in spite of it. Not pain in itself, but our attitude toward it—that is what may lead to saintliness. "Nothing can happen to us which has any inherent power to smash us. Nothing can happen to us from which we cannot gather a harvest."¹³

When Harry Lauder, who had brought joy and laughter into so many hearts, lost his son in the war, he stood before the grave with tears streaming down his face and whispered, "Thank you, my son, thank you." A friend standing near by came to him and asked, "Does God weep when a laddie dies?" And Harry Lauder replied, "There are three roads a man may take when he has been struck as I have: there is the road to despair, the road to drink, and the road to God. I have chosen the road to God." Through his heartbreaking suffering Harry Lauder reaped a richer, finer, more useful life. He learned how to grasp his suffering and sorrow and make them yield a fruitful harvest for character and service.

Christianity affirms that ultimately God can and will achieve his divine purpose for a painless world, in spite of, and even through, suffering. He may temporarily be thwarted, frustrated, evaded, and defeated, but eventually he will win. Many a famous general has lost an occasional battle, and yet has gone on to win the campaign. Our religion proclaims a God whose original and ideal intention was health of body and mind and soul for every human being, but whose intention has been sadly thwarted by the folly and ignorance and sin of man. But pain and evil will not be allowed to have the last word; they are not the ultimate facts or factors in the human-divine drama on earth. The will and purpose of God shall yet prevail. Meanwhile, we must continue to live in a dangerous and

¹³ Leslie D. Weatherhead, *Why Do Men Suffer?* The Abingdon Press, 1936, p. 145.

pain-ridden world where "ten thousand things can happen to us which are not the will of God, but nothing can happen which it is beyond God's plan and purpose to redeem and use."¹⁴ Even man's most awful sin—the Crucifixion—he turned into the greatest redeeming act in history.

Our God is against pain. Beyond that minimum which serves as a warning that something is wrong, all suffering is contrary to the will of God. It is to be fought and conquered and banished. According to our Gospels, Jesus apparently viewed all pain as evil. A large part of his ministry was devoted to its alleviation and cure. "He steadfastly set himself to reduce the sum of pain. So far as we know, he never met a case of pain which he did not relieve, if the conditions were present for his doing so."¹⁵ Pain was an evil to be removed at any cost of pain. It is God's will that pain shall be abolished from his universe forever and ever. He who is able to redeem from sin will not be defeated by suffering. Jesus never dealt with it as a problem to be solved, but as an evil to be banished. He was never confounded by its mystery or paralyzed by its sinister effects. He faced it on the Cross in one of its most terrible forms, and made it yield a spiritual harvest for himself and his disciples.

Our religion meets the challenge of suffering, not by measuring the amount of good which may be wrung from the agonies of ages of pain, but by revealing the suffering of God in the death of his Son on the Cross. It is only as we witness his suffering that we can tolerate the idea that this pain-racked world is his world, and believe that it carries within its tragic life the power of omnipotent, redeeming, vicarious love, the sole power that can conquer pain and evil. When Martin Luther was ill, and suffering the greatest pain, he did not lose his Christian faith and courage. Between his groans he said: "These pains and troubles here are like the type which the printers set; as they look now, we have to read them backwards, and they seem to have no sense or meaning in them; but yonder, when the Lord prints us off in the life to come, we shall find that they make brave reading."¹⁶

Since pain and evil are contrary to the will of God, and since they must therefore be defeated and banished from human life, it is the urgent duty of every one of us to meet the challenge of our own suffering by joining God in this agelong fight against a common foe. The army of consecrated sufferers is steadily marching on to a definite victory, and the

¹⁴ Leslie D. Weatherhead, *Ibid.*, p. 85.

¹⁵ *Hastings Dictionary*, *loc. cit.*

¹⁶ Martin Luther.

banner it carries is a Cross. God is no mere spectator of the tragic battle of human life; he is in the thick of it. Being at the heart of life, he suffers with us, carrying the major part of the burden. And the world's redemption rests with a suffering God and his suffering followers.

The final message of Christianity to a world in pain and evil proclaims this immortal hope: "There shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away."¹⁷

¹⁷ Rev. 21:4.

Christian Education After Ten Years of Ecumenical Thinking

E. G. HOMRIGHAUSEN

A LITTLE OVER TEN YEARS AGO, Dr. George A. Coe, the pioneer of modern religious education, started a long discussion in the pages of the *International Journal of Religious Education* by publishing an article on the relation of the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences of 1937 to Christian education. The gist of his contention was that these ecumenical conferences put religious education in peril because of their theological emphases. The theological aspects of those ecumenical gatherings were such as to call in question all the assumptions upon which modern religious education had been founded and developed.

What Coe believed he saw in Oxford and Edinburgh was a trend toward continental, or Barthian, theology; he practically identified the two. This theology seemed to put so much emphasis upon the objective and divine aspects of the Christian faith, that the psychological, historical, sociological, and anthropological realities of religion and life were not only ignored, but regarded as dangerous. This development, Coe contended, would result in the end of present-day religious education.

Some of us took up Coe's challenge and contended for the serious consideration of theology on the part of modern religious educators. We were not wholly in agreement with modern neo-orthodoxy, but we believed that it was high time that religious education should become Christian; and to do so it would have to become far more definitive and realistic regarding its aims, the nature of man, the nature of the educational process, the place of the Bible in education, the meaning of "educated" man in the Christian sense, and a host of other issues. We felt that it was not enough to know man psychologically, historically, and sociologically; we needed to know him Christianly and existentially. We also felt that the Christian interpretation of man must be explored more earnestly and profoundly than Coe and his colleagues had done; for we believed that the demonic expressions of human nature made it incumbent upon us to find a more realistic interpretation, and consequently a more radical way of redemp-

ELMER G. HOMRIGHAUSEN, Th.D., D.D., is Thomas W. Synnott Professor of Christian Education at Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. He finds many changes of emphasis and method in Christian education during the last decade.

tion for man. We could not so easily equate the Christian conception of man, God, sin, salvation, the meaning of history, etc., with modern naturalism or monistic idealism, even though they used Christian terminology. With us, it was not at all a matter of continental or Barthian or neo-orthodox theology versus American theology. It was rather a matter of truth, of reality. We had to deal with realities, we felt, if we were to be good Christian educators. And we had to take very seriously the Christian revelation, which we now began to see and understand in a more relevant and profound sense.

Readers will recall the series of articles which ran in the *Journal*. Whether we got anywhere in our verbal warfare of articles is a question. At least the whole problem was opened up for discussion. Many Christian educators read the series and were stimulated to think further about their work.

But has anything happened in Christian education in the past ten years?

1. For one thing, theology is certainly getting more consideration in Christian educational circles than it did ten years ago. A number of shorter books have appeared seeking to provide a theology for laymen. One book has appeared which aims to provide a theology for Sunday-school teachers. One thinks of the books of C. S. Lewis as attempts at modern apologetics for laymen. Christian teachers are more eager than ever to know what Christianity is and what Christians may and must believe. Theology is not everything, to be sure, but it is a necessity for guidance, for clarity and sanity of mind, and for criticism of fallacious ideas which disintegrate life. While theology is a servant and not a master, it is essential in directing Christian education, and in determining the content of Christian nurture. Theology is becoming more biblical, that is, more objective *and* subjective; theological *and* psychological. Theology is a set of working intellectual convictions based upon what Christians believe to be the revelation of God in history. This revelation is seen in action in the history which the Bible faithfully presents, and which Christianity in history illustrates. The reality of and truth about God, man, history, and their interrelation are delineated in the Bible so as to give us an adequate and sufficient revelation of God, man, and history. This revelation is centered in God, but it is set within the context of human personality and temporal life. Christian education turns to this revelation for guidance on the nature of man and God, and on the ends and processes of education toward personal and social reality.

I would not be interpreted as saying that Christian educators today see eye to eye on theological matters. Most of them are still related to denominational theological traditions. These, however, are slowly being affected by a more positive evangelical Christianity which is quite a common possession. The theological study of Christian education by a competent Committee of the International Council of Religious Education, and summarized in Paul Vieth's *The Church and Christian Education*, indicates how far that co-operative body of Christian Education has gone in the last ten years in its movement toward a more evangelical Christianity. We also have our exponents of what may be termed naturalist, liberal, orthodox, constructive conservative, and neo-orthodox theological positions in Christian education. There is tension between them, to be sure, as there must be; but it seems to me that the rank and file of Christian educators today are what may be termed positive, constructive conservatives in theology.

2. Another development in the last ten years has been the production of new curriculum materials, based upon long and corporate thought on behalf of many experts, including theologians! One thinks of the expensive and audacious Church and Home Series which has now been issued by the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. Few can realize the theological and the pedagogical effort that has gone into the making of this unified parish system of Christian education. It is based upon the theology of the Presbyterian Church. It is also put up in more permanent form. It pioneers in what may be termed an "evangelical methodology." The editor-in-chief of the series is known primarily as a theologian. Other denominations are making similar changes. Dr. Ernest Ligon has also pioneered in constructing a new curriculum. It, too, is more theological, psychological, and sociological. The Presbyterian series shows very distinctly the influence of theology upon curriculum-making. The three great themes around which the entire system revolves are: Jesus Christ, Bible, and Church. And the context of the nurture is both home and church.

3. A third emphasis during the last ten years has been the relation of the Bible to Christian education. Once the Bible was taught in rote fashion, its verses and passages taken as objective truths to be memorized, interpreted, and applied. The emphasis then shifted to the life-situation approach, and the Bible was used only as its parts applied to human problems. The first method proved rather unreal and artificial, the latter has proven relativistic and socio-ethical. Now, the Bible is coming into its

own,
origin
God?
throu
and "
for m
and s
fellow
again
best a
to ou
cator?
taugh
speak

center
was a
ern r
educa
Today
prima
mind
and l
that l
now
total
a ritu
what
theole
integr
Chris
Dr. V
much
Chris

of eva
gelism
exper
Chris

own, for it is increasingly regarded as the Book from which we learn the origin, meaning, nature, predicament, salvation, and destiny of life from God's point of view. It is a book both human and divine. It is interpreted through the best historical and linguistic methods. It is seen in a new and "living" light. Through it we learn that God has spoken to and acted for men, and through it he still speaks to those who search the Scripture and study it with intelligence, open-mindedness, and prayerfulness in the fellowship of the church. Christian education today is finding the Bible again, for it is discovering that in this Book and in it alone do we find the best and most adequate—one may say final—interpretation of and answer to our human problems. This Bible is, the Book of Life; it is the educator's supreme and indispensable textbook. But the Bible must be *rightly* taught, so that the living God who speaks and acts in and through it may speak to those who read and study it today.

4. A fourth concern in Christian education in the last ten years has centered upon the place of the home in Christian nurture. This, of course, was a strong emphasis in Horace Bushnell's *Christian Nurture*. But modern religious education, in its desire to develop social-mindedness in the education process, overlooked the unique nature of the Christian home. Today, we understand much better than we did the importance of this primary social organism which so early and potently molds the growing mind. The home is the best laboratory in which Christianity can be learned and lived. We have come to see that it is psychologically naïve to think that by drawing children into a church school or other religious groups, now and then, we may accomplish the ends of Christian nurture. The *total* environment of the growing life must be so saturated with a spirit, a ritual, an attitude, a way of community living, that what is taught and what is lived in the community are one and the same thing. The new theology speaks much of the church and the Christian community as integral to the very nature of the Christian faith. It is impossible to have Christian education without a community which has a spirit and a faith. Dr. Wesner Fallaw of Andover Newton Theological Seminary has done much to make educators and churches aware of the place of the home in Christian nurture.

5. A fifth development in the last ten years has been the introduction of evangelism into education. There was a time when education and evangelism were at loggerheads. The one believed in a quick Christianizing experience through conversion, the other believed in a long period of Christianizing experience through growth and education. Both are right!

And both belong to the church. The trouble with the advocates of each approach is that each regards the other as wrong. Life is both continuous and saltatory, that is, life is a process and it is also a series of great experiences which cannot be explained in terms of ordinary cause and effect. The Christian life is a gift of God, which must be worked out, or achieved, over a long period of time. A man is not like a carrot or an animal. The vegetable and the animal both grow by a process. But man, possessed of something unique—of the power of imagination, of judgment, of self-criticism, of the image of God—is a different *kind* of being. He is not only a creature who may know, make decisions, appreciate beauty, but he may believe. Education, in a way, prepares the way for evangelism, and education also supports evangelism. The two always go together. Even the evangelist educates his prospective converts before they can know what he asks them to believe. And the Christian educator teaches Christian truth with an appeal to his students to make judgments regarding it and to arrive at decisions of faith about it. Christian truth is personal; it is learned through commitment. The whole existence of the learner is involved when facing the God of the Bible, and especially as he is revealed in Jesus Christ.

Christian education has become more evangelistic and Christocentric, less rationalistic and "religious." It is encouraging to see how the International Council of Religious Education and the Federal Council's Department of Evangelism are working together in the Mission to Teachers. This is a project in educational evangelism. True education is evangelism; true evangelism is educational. Evangelism without education may become fanatical; education without evangelism may become sterile. Without evangelism, education is not Christian nor can it remain Christian; without education, evangelism is not informed with Christian truth nor can it produce the full-statured person in Christ.

6. A sixth emphasis in Christian education in the last ten years has been upon the church. The older religious education, to be sure, stressed the social nature of the educational process, but it did not give the church its proper and unique interpretation. In fact, I recall that in my graduate studies in the twenties, the church was often regarded as a hindrance to Christianity. Life, it was maintained, must be set within the total social context. Now, no one would deny that the church is composed of sinful people, that it has not measured up to its high profession in its communal life, and that in many ways it does present a "scandal" to the world. No one can deny the total social context of life. But, within the total social

cont
the C
That
which
churc
it eva
it giv
Chris
world
divid

is nu
would
the ch
for C
tones
Chris
one w
ber of

upon
proble
educat
citizen
tion o
decisio
buildi
of Ch
ways
co-op
They
Sunda
who b
school
ethica
with o
and a
the pu
school

context there is such a reality as the Christian community. It embraces the Christian home, the Christian school, and various Christian groups. That church is different in spirit from other organizations. It does things which other organizations do not do, at least not in the way in which the church does them and not for the same reasons. The church worships, it evangelizes, it teaches, its members have fellowship with one another, it gives to relieve the needs of others. This church has a center in Jesus Christ. It has a faith. It is in the world and yet somehow not of the world. It is a unique community. It is local yet universal, united though divided, and it is catholic in reality although not in actuality.

The Christian life is set within this community. Christian nurture is nurture in this community; without that community Christian nurture would be a very difficult task. Christian educators realize how important the church is in education. Worship is essential in the educational process, for Christianity is more than creed and doctrine; it is ritual and emotional tones and attitudes as well. These are engendered in the community. Christian education has for its end the making of the full-statured person, one who in body, mind, soul, and strength is a child of God and a member of the divine-human community.

7. Seventh, a new emphasis is being placed by Christian educators upon the relation of Christianity to public education. This is a difficult problem in every part of the world. States today are seeking to control education for propaganda ends; they wish to create the character of their citizenry. In the United States, it is the fear of breaking down the separation of church from state that has brought about the recent Supreme Court decision against the legality of released-time religious education in school buildings. There are several points of view on the question. One group of Christian educators believes that the church should not seek to find ways and means of carrying on Christian education in the schools, or in co-operation with the schools outside school buildings on released time. They believe the church must do its own education in home, church, and Sunday school, and on time outside of school hours. There are others who believe that an idealistic form of Christianity may be taught in the schools. This kind of Christian education would not be sectarian, but ethical, historical, and social in content. Such ethical theism is in harmony with our democratic way of living and acting, devoid of sectarian dogmas, and agreeable to most people. There is a third group which holds that the public schools should give a place to religion in their curriculum. The schools would teach the history, beliefs, etc., of all religions objectively.

Religion of this kind would be taught by the schools and not by the churches. This would not violate the constitution, and it would make the schools responsible for a subject which they all too easily avoid or evade. The problems connected with the "teaching" of "religion" according to this plan are great indeed. A fourth group believes that there ought to be some way by which the schools and the churches may work together for their mutual benefit. This group, however, has been discouraged through the Supreme Court decision, and it is difficult to tell what its future will be.

It is evident, however, that the churches are today sensing their responsibility toward the children of the nation who are receiving no religious education. Realizing that the churches cannot do this task, they are nevertheless pressing the public authorities with the absolute necessity of taking the religious aspects of public education seriously. Unless this is done the nation will soon possess no sound basis for morality and citizenship.

8. Christian education in the last decade has become concerned about certain age-groups and media of communication. It has become quite seriously interested in young adults who are in the process of building homes, rearing children, and entering upon their careers. This group represents a strategic and promising section of the population which has all too long been neglected by the church. Whereas the emphasis of a generation ago was on the importance of the child, today the stress is upon the importance of adults. They lead children one way or another. Denominational youth fellowships are uniting young people today in a new and serious way around projects of work study, evangelism, stewardship, personal religious living, and fellowship. These fellowships are definitely church-centered.

9. Another recent interest in Christian education has been a confronting of young people with the challenge to enter full-time church service. The Federal Council of Churches has established a commission to channel this concern, and most denominations now have secretaries who give themselves to recruiting, counseling, and organizing young people in the interest of vocational guidance. Another significant development in the last decade has been the organization of men's fellowships with a view to getting them interested in the total work of the church and of outfitting them to take their places in the life of the world as Christians. In Europe, the emphasis upon lay Christianity now is marked—since in many European churches the layman has had little place in the life and work of the churches,

whereas in the United States laymen have always taken a prominent and active part. Church women have always had strong missionary, stewardship, social, and family-life programs of education. But with the growth in the realization that the church is laity as well as clergy, the emphasis is today being placed upon men's brotherhoods and fellowships with a view to giving men an insight into the nature, function, and outreach of the church of which they are a part, so that Christianity may be implemented in life.

10. There is also evident in Christian education a strong emphasis on audio-visual education. Much of it is due to the fact that people today are being profoundly influenced through pictures and charts of various kinds. Christian educators feel that these modern means of communication must be used as effectively by the church as they were by the military during the war, and as they are now being used in educational institutions. This development has been phenomenal, and undoubtedly it will be of value. The Protestant Film Commission is employing the best talent available not only to make pictures, but to provide some Christian guidance to film producers. However, little thought has gone into the philosophy of this means of education. There is great danger in succumbing to the tabloid mind, and to the desire to make everything plain. It is impossible to make the Christian faith "plain" at the deepest level. Audio-visual aids are being widely used today; but they need to be carefully examined lest they teach a false Christianity, or make real Christianity so plain that it is bereft of mystery, depth, and ideational content.

11. Last and most significant of all, Christian education becomes increasingly ecumenical in organization, function, and outlook. The old World Sunday School Association was a pioneer in ecumenicity. It has now become the World Council of Christian Education. The quarterly publication of the Council is one of the finest, and it contains reports and articles on Christian education which give the reader a world survey of the educational activities of the churches. The international congress planned for Toronto next August will attract people from every part of the world. There is much for Christian educators to learn from their comrades as they work in different and varied situations. The world task of Christian teaching is today seen in the light of the growing understanding of the global nature of the Christian faith. However, the World Council of Christian Education still has to work out relationships with the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches. The relation of world Christian education to the constituent churches of

the I.M.C. and the W.C.C. is still in a hazy and infant stage of development. It is my feeling that only as world Christian education becomes more "churchly" in theology, in attitude, and in relationships, will greater unity be achieved. Perhaps the development now taking place in the United States whereby the Federal Council and the International Council of Religious Education and other interdenominational bodies are moving toward unity is a pattern of action that must take place on the ecumenical level of church co-operation.

There is much more that might be said about the Christian education of our time as compared with that of ten years ago. Christian education today partakes of the spirit of urgency in the light of the seriousness of the times. Further, it is evident today that the education of man is a total business, and that Christian education must be concerned with the education of the whole man. The nature of the Christian faith demands it, and the crisis of man today points toward it. Perhaps one may detect more of an eschatological note in Christian education today. "In the midst of life we are in death." We have known tragedy, and no easy-going education infused with sentimentality is adequate in our time. We are sensing afresh today that the secret of Christian education is in the personality of the Christian teacher. Unless the teacher knows God through personal experience, he will have little to communicate to others, no matter how well he may employ techniques. It is through faith that God is known, and faith is mysteriously communicated through people who are witnesses of what they have seen and heard. And last of all, we have come to see that Christianity can be communicated only through persons who identify themselves with those whom they seek to teach. The principle of the Incarnation is necessary to teach the Christian faith. Teachers must learn to sit with those they teach, and to learn about them through identifying love. Proud people cannot teach Christianity.

These, then, represent some of the developments in Christian education during the last ten years. It is quite evident that these trends can be seen in the field of higher Christian education, as well as in theological education. Separate studies in these two fields would yield something of the same findings which this paper reports. Many of these trends have been due to the emphases which were stressed at Oxford and Edinburgh. The good in the old has not been done away with, rather, it has been interpreted from a more Christian, biblical, radical, and realistic point of view. The old in the Christian tradition has not been eradicated, rather, it has come to life in a new and more vital way.

At Amsterdam, little if any mention was made of Christian education. I, personally, felt rather keenly about this omission. One whole section was devoted to *The Witness of the Church to God's Design*. Now that Amsterdam is past, and I look back upon its work, I have come to see that witness is the church's and the Christian's major task. A good Christian educator is a good witness. It is essential that this witness be made in pastoral work, in worship, in service, in stewardship, in the home, in the factory, on the farm, in the office. And witness must be made through Christian education! If education does not witness to Christ, it is not Christian! If it does not proceed from a Christian teacher, or a church, which has seen, heard, felt, and experienced something, it lacks the authentic note of Christian witness.

While Amsterdam could have said much about Christian education, it did not ignore it. Oxford made room for a whole section on Christian education. Ten years later, the church had moved to such an extent that it no longer was willing to give attention to the church's separate ministries; it would rather deal with the general question of witness through *all* the ministries of the church. Some may say that Amsterdam neglected education, and they are partially right. Others, again, may say that Amsterdam took education for granted and challenged it, together with all other church ministries, to engage in the primary task of witnessing to God's design. Amsterdam regarded Christian education as a form of witness to the Christian faith. After all, is this not the essential nature of Christian education?

The Community of Immortals

C. LEWIS ROBSON

THE HOPE OF IMMORTALITY does not arise, as secularists too often have supposed, from the instinct of self-preservation. If we have life only as we revolve around ourselves, there is no immortality. If we are like tops whose equilibrium and expression result from rapidity of revolution (and sometimes it seems that modern man believes he can stand only as he spins!), then the idea of immortality has no pertinence. Death, then, would be but the running down of physical energy and the toppling of a toy. The conviction of the necessity of immortality, rather, is gained not from the contemplation of ourselves but from our relationships with others.

I

When we consider what we mean to others, due not to any intrinsic worth within ourselves but to their investment in us, we see our duty to live. The desire for immortality is an expression of our sense of duty to conserve and develop that which others have invested in us. The youth who has been educated at great sacrifice dares not run out on his family. Nor does he desire to do so, unless he is very selfish. The man who is convinced that others count on him is seldom numbered among those who take their own lives. The suicide, if at all sane, is usually convinced that no one cares much about him. But one who sees life as a divinely woven tapestry, each figure a part of other figures and all a part of the whole, desires eternal life. No one who sees himself as the warp and woof into which others have woven beauty and depth, desires death or dares to believe death to be extinction. We have a duty to live, for we hold in ourselves the investments of others.

For emotional as well as ethical reasons we desire immortality. The strength of our longing springs from the sense of emasculation that comes to us with the loss of a friend. A part of us has gone. We have lost not a possession, some treasure or tool or toy, we have lost a part of ourselves. A *part of us* has gone. There are emotional and spiritual nerves, rooted in the soul, which reach out for an organ of personality that is no longer

C. LEWIS ROBSON is Minister of the Gatch Memorial Methodist Church, Belair Road and White Avenue, Baltimore 6, Maryland. He treats here of the strongly social element in the Christian teaching on the future life.

there. It is not morbidness that causes our attention to turn again and again to the tenderness at the point of amputation. It is the search of the soul for completeness, for itself. The experience is not of pain, simply, nor exactly of aloneness. It is the consciousness of an aching void, of a great emptiness that cries out for that organ of the soul that has been removed. As blood rushes from a wound, seeking to feed the extracted organ, so our love pours, in sorrow, from the wound of the soul.

Life is fellowship, communion. Its richness is determined by the quality and number of persons with whom we share personal experiences. Charles Lamb, that "artist in affection," has described his experience of the loss of friends.

Two or three have died within the last two twelvemonths and so many parts of me have been numbed. One sees a picture, reads an anecdote, starts a casual fancy, and thinks to tell it to this person in preference to every other: the person is gone whom it would have particularly suited. It won't do for another. . . . Thus one distributes oneself about: and now for many parts of me I have lost the market.¹

We are like honeysuckle that roots wherever a new growth touches. Probably it is only in bereavement that we discover how much of our personality is the life of another rooted in ourselves.

The experience of bereavement, then, is the discovery or the re-discovery of the community of personality. It is then, if not before, that we discover that human personality is not simple but complex. We learn that we are not spinning tops, however ornate and noisy. Nor are we marbles in a pinball machine, nor yet mistletoe upon a tree. We discover that we are vital cells of an organ we call the family, and of another organ we call the community, all parts of the body of humanity. The same spiritual blood flows through many of us, and the same nourishment feeds our souls, while the same vital stimuli alert our nervous systems. We are living cells, vital organs of some living body of persons.

In the hour of bereavement we discover anew that there are no merely individual entities in human affairs, that the idea of individuality simply denotes the point at which many wires and cables of human influence converge. Every man is a switchboard, none a broadcasting station. In this experience of deprivation we learn that our lives root not within ourselves but in those to whom we are related by proximity, purpose, or comradeship in any of life's ventures. I am not only a bank in which others have made deposit, but also a center of social entanglement. I

¹ Drew, Elizabeth, *The Enjoyment of Literature*. W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., p. 26.

am not a stone, a tree, or a star in some solar system. I am an organ sustaining and sustained by others.

II

The matrix of personality is the community. In the intimate fellowship or communion of the family, personality is called into being and nurtured into adolescence. In the neighborhood and nation it is nurtured into maturity. This being true, we cannot speak of immortality as if a cork bobbed again to the surface of the sea, nor as if a drop of water returned to the ocean, nor even as if a root put forth a new branch in spring. Neither may we conceive of an isolated ego, a naked *I*, persisting after death merely on the basis of its own being, however worthy. We could only describe that conception in terms of a stranger in an icehouse—bare, frigid existence. And the conception of pure communion with God only, as some forms of mystical experience imply, will not do, for God is *our* Father. There is no conception of immortality that will satisfy either our understanding of the social genesis of the person or our Christian view of God, except some experience of community. As a child growing up among animals in a jungle could not develop personality, so a being in eternity without an eternal community could neither improve personality nor retain it.

The problem in personal development is to find a community, a fellowship that will develop the individual while accepting the contribution of the growing personality. When the baby is born it must be born into a community—it needs a family to support its first venture into life. When the child leaves the nursery, there must be a school for its further development. When the adolescent leaves school, there must be a college, if he is to develop along intellectual lines. The problem of personality is always the problem of community, a fellowship that will bring forth the higher personal experience. So the problem of immortality is to find a community that will call forth this new kind of personal experience. Since personality *is* shared experience, eternal personality requires eternal fellowship in which to discover and share rich experiences. The need is for a community of immortals.

III

We are greatly indebted to Dr. Charles H. Dodd for his treatment of this whole problem in his Ingersoll Lecture,² and especially for his solu-

² *The Communion of Saints*. Harvard University Press, 1936.

tion of the problem of the immortal community. The solution is found in the doctrine of the communion of the saints; that is, the fellowship of the saved (for in the New Testament the saint is the saved one). In the true Christian church we have a community which is both spiritual and eternal. Dr. John Knox points out that St. Paul sometimes uses the term "Christ" to mean the heavenly community now present in history and into which we are united when we are "in Christ." As members of the body of Christ, the believer shares in the life of the eternal order which is now emerging into time.³ Here is a society for the soul, a community for personal experience that knows no limits of time or space, the church. Here is a fellowship not determined by any interest or affinity common among men. "It is constituted solely by the dependence of all its members upon the grace of God. The relations which subsist among them are determined by the divine love revealed in Christ."⁴ Yea, more, released through Christ. They are the recipients of his love and they love one another, not only with human affection but "with the love of God which is shed abroad in their hearts. This is the inexhaustible source of life which they share."⁵

This love of God shed abroad in the church is the factor of difference between the church as a community and all other associations of men—noble and worthy though many of these are. The church is not to be likened to a society of men creating its own values in fellowship, like an organization of teachers or preachers. Nor is it to be likened to a natural family grouped together by the accident of birth, developing affections and affinities in the home. Rather, the church is to be likened to a family gathered by a king into his home—a king whose love invites any of his subjects, prince or peasant, to come and live with him. The condition is belief in the Son who bears the invitation, and the common bond is the love of the king for them. The king's love is for them the cohesive and exalting factor. In the New Testament, "love" usually means God's love of us, not our love of God.⁶ In the church the love of God shed abroad in our hearts becomes the bond of community for full personal development and gives eternal quality to our lives. This love of God is the one absolute self-sustaining factor; it is the ultimate environment of the soul and hence the soul's everlasting existence.

³ Knox, John, *On the Meaning of Christ*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947, pp. 22, 23.

⁴ Dodd, C. H., *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁶ Knox, John, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

Now, in finding the church a community that is eternal because it lives within the love of God, we have discovered eternal life within time. It is here and now that we find the community for eternal life. Those who find this fellowship or community of the saved become part of a mighty marching army, and death to them is but the point they cross in the march from the battlefield of time into the homeland of eternity. When they pass out of this age they do not pass out of society or out of community, but continue within the fellowship created by the love of God, wherein they found themselves on earth. They are still in full possession of the personal development achieved upon earth, for they are still in the same environment—the eternal love of God; and the same community—those who reflect this love. Here, then, is found for the soul its eternal community, and immortality is possible because further and richer experiences of personal relations are opened up before it.

From all this we derive two comforting thoughts:

1. The communion of saints is an experience of sharing that crosses the boundary between time and eternity.

In history the past flows into the future, and the future never repays the past its debt. But Dr. Dodd suggests⁷ that in the church the communion of saints is reciprocal. We are what we are because of those who have lived and gone to glory, while they are depending upon us for their own perfection. "All these, though well attested by their faith, did not receive what was promised, since God had foreseen something better for us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect."⁸ Here is a profound and intelligent conception of eternal personal growth in the church. Sanctification is not an instantaneous gift at death, but the continuing goal of the total Christian community for all the faithful.

In another place the author of Hebrews affirms of the saints, "you have come . . . to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable angels in festal gathering, and to the assembly of the first born who are enrolled in heaven, and to a judge who is God of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect. . . ."⁹ There is his glorious picture of the church triumphant, joyous in eternity, to which the saints on earth have come, and in communion with which, in God's love, they find eternal life. In the finding they make contribution to the church in heaven. Dr. Dodd believes, I think rightly, that through this communion

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 18f.

⁸ Heb. 11:39, 40 (Biblical quotations are from the Revised Standard Version).

⁹ Heb. 12:22, 23.

of t
who
the
edu
fect
that
the
in h
on e

real
life
the
lasti
enco
of w
and
Jesu
with
Mou
ciple
fects
that

insep
lines
that

comf
and t
a par
prese
they

of the saints the richer future returns its debt to the past and perfects those whose labors of faith made possible the development of that future. As the son contributes to the enrichment of the parents who sacrifice for his education, so the church even today on earth has its gifts of love and perfecting for those more primitive saints of the past. St. Paul points out that he was given grace to preach to the Gentiles so that through the church the wisdom of God might be made known to the principalities and powers in heavenly places. In the traffic between time and eternity, the church on earth teaches and enriches the church in heaven.

2. But we derive even greater comfort from this doctrine when we realize that through such communion those who have passed out of this life have not passed out of our lives. By the Communion of Saints we mean the continuation of the fellowship with those who have entered into everlasting life. The author of Hebrews sees these persons all around us, encouraging us to keep faith: "since we are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight and sin which clings so closely, and let us run with perseverance the race that is set before us, looking to Jesus, the pioneer and perfecter of our faith. . . ." ¹⁰ In this communion with the saints, Jesus is, as in all things, our pioneer. When on the Mount on Transfiguration he looked forward to the cross, the three disciples saw Moses and Elijah talking with him. In this experience he perfects us. When the disciples themselves were bereaved and defeated by that bereavement, Jesus came to them, turning defeat into victory.

An elderly saint, bereaved of a lifelong mate from whom he had been inseparable, was asked the source of his radiance through years of loneliness. "When Mary died," said he, "I asked God for but one thing: that I might have a sense of her presence. That he has given me."

The pain of bereavement is the pain of losing part of oneself. The comfort of the Communion of Saints is that Christ is not dead but risen, and that our beloved lives ever in the love of him who never dies. He is a part of Christ of whom we partake, and through whom our beloved's presence is brought home to our souls. Those of yesterday are not gone, they are eternal persons, eternal in the community of believers.

¹⁰ Heb. 12:1, 2.

A Second Look at Toynbee

DAVID WESLEY SOPER

NOW THAT THE TUMULT and the shouting of first studies of Toynbee have died down, it may be in order to take a second look. Digest upon digest has appeared, and digests of digests. On the whole, we have approached only the externals of the twentieth-century Isaiah; we have been preoccupied with the mechanics of his system; we are familiar with challenge and response, withdrawal and return, external and internal proletariats, social schism, creative and dominant minorities, archaism, futurism, detachment and transfiguration, the philosophical contemporaneity of civilizations, and fratricidal internecine warfare as the antepenultimate stage before oblivion. These presentations have been necessary ground-clearing operations. It is time for a deeper penetration, an analysis of pivotal presuppositions. The structure of Toynbee's view of history is clear, but his mind, as has often been suggested and as often forgotten, is the mind of a prophet, a poet, a seer. His ideas transcend his mechanics; his presuppositions have profound philosophical roots. It is these basic ideas, the pillars upon which rests his colossal mental superstructure, which should engage attention. From years of sustained study in the primary Toynbee, the earlier works as well as the magnum opus, a thousand ideas have emerged; three seem irreducible: Toynbee's view of Man, of Society, and of God. These ideas are never unrelated, yet ever distinguishable. Beneath the surface of Toynbee's system they live and move—to delight or dismay his critics.

Following the study of Toynbee's major and minor works, the writer of this essay was stimulated and edified by an interview with the Prophet at Chatham House, London, in the presence of Mrs. Toynbee, formerly Veronica M. Boulter. It was she who had been kind enough to arrange the meeting. Toynbee's basic conclusions were discussed at length. It cannot be regarded as unfortunate that a modern student has added Toynbee to a lengthening list of beloved masters.

PERSONAL

For a generation or two men have often put asunder what God has

DAVID WESLEY SOPER, A.M., B.D., Ph.D., is Professor and Chairman of the Department of Religion, Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin. He offers us a study of the eminent historian in whom "history passes over into theology."

united, history and theology. Historians have been historians only, and theologians mere theologians. The Toynbee who disturbs modern thought has had the effrontery to reunite the ancient allies. His daring flight on the historical trapeze has elicited universal admiration. His bitterest enemies have yielded grudging appreciation. Simon-pure obscurantists, isolationists, race-worshippers, rationalists, cynics, and deists—all have mixed rejoicing with rejection. In all likelihood, he will educate many obscurantists and liberate some rationalists.

"History passes over into theology,"¹ in time and in Toynbee, but few historians are able to make the transition. Many consider Toynbee guilty of treason. But all pioneers who blaze trails beyond provinciality are inevitably so classified.

By way of review, a brief biography may be of value. An uncle, Arnold Toynbee, author of the penetrating volume, *The Industrial Revolution*, was the eminent economist of Balliol College, Oxford, at the turn of the century. Our subject's father was a social worker, and his mother was among the first of British women to receive college degrees. He was born in London, April 14th, 1889. He received an old-fashioned education in the Greek and Latin classics at Winchester and Balliol Colleges, Oxford. Today he thinks in classical Greek as well as in English. After graduation he wandered for a year among the ruins of ancient Greece, and meditated upon the archives in the British Archeological School at Athens. The power of another civilization had passed to ashes; what was to be the future of his own? From 1912 to 1915 he was fellow and tutor in ancient history at Balliol. His two books, *Nationality and the War* and *The New Europe*, in 1915, established his reputation as a writer with charm and an interpreter with insight. In 1915 he entered the Political Intelligence Department of the Foreign Office. His 1917 volumes on the *German Terror* in Belgium and France resembled his 1915 *Armenian Atrocities* in scholarly if bloodthirsty realism. He was a member of the Middle Eastern section of the British delegation to the Paris Peace Conference, and in the same year, 1919, was appointed Koraes Professor of Byzantine and Modern Greek Language, Literature, and History at the University of London. There in 1925 he was made Research Professor of International History and, at the same time, Director of Studies at the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

As correspondent on the Greco-Turkish War (1921-22) he represented *The Manchester Guardian*, and subsequently published *The Western*

¹ Arnold J. Toynbee, *Civilisation on Trial*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1948, p. v.

Question in Greece and Turkey. He reinvestigated Turkish internal affairs in 1923 for the magazine *Asia*. With the invaluable Miss Boulter, Toynbee began (1924) the International Survey series, documentary, comprehensive, interpretative. He published his authoritative *The World After the Peace Conference* in 1925, and the lighter *Journey to China* in 1931.

As everyone now knows, Toynbee conceived his nine-volume *Study of History* in 1922. He jotted down the core of the project on a half sheet of writing paper, and expanded the outline in two years to the overall plan still pursued. He has been at work on the nine volumes ever since, the remaining three being scheduled for 1950. At the writer's interview with Toynbee (1947), he was busy on volume seven. The first three volumes appeared in 1934, the second three in 1939. His winters are devoted to the International Survey series, and his summers, in Yorkshire, to the *Study of History*. D. C. Somervell, assistant master in English at the Tonbridge Public School, issued in 1947 his one-volume summary, capturing the argument but missing the poetic vision and the Olympian sweep of the original. *Civilization on Trial*, for the layman, appeared in 1948. In 1924 he had compiled the anthologies, *Greek Historical Thought* and *Greek Civilization and Character*; he had edited *British Commonwealth Relations* in 1934. On a Rockefeller Fund grant he began in 1945 a *History of International Relations 1939-49*.

During World War II, Toynbee was Director of Foreign Research of the Royal Institute of International Affairs from 1939 to 1943, and from 1943 to 1946 was Director of the Research Department of the British Foreign Office. Toynbee was divorced from Rosalind Murray, daughter of Gilbert Murray, in 1945, and subsequently married Veronica M. Boulter. There are three sons from the first marriage.

His style as a writer is worthy of sustained study. It possesses grace and facility, is unhurried in pace, and abounds in biblical similes. He combines impeccable scholarship and profound insight with the ability to write humorous and delightful footnotes.

He holds honorary degrees from Oxford, Princeton, and Birmingham Universities, has been a fellow of the British Academy since 1937. In 1947, on his fifth trip to the States, he delivered a series of lectures on "Encounters Between Civilizations" at Bryn Mawr, and in 1948 the Bampton Lectures at Columbia. At his present post in the Princeton School of Advanced Studies, he has proven himself not the inaccessible recluse; rather he has made himself available far and near. He is one of

the most approachable of men. At the writer's interview with Toynbee in London, he felt that the great man was as much a saint as a scholar, that he possessed a magnanimity of mind and a charity of spirit not unlike that of the author of the First Epistle of John.

MAN

Historians who transcend history and become theologians, like sociologists who transcend sociology and become philosophers, are anathema to their specialist colleagues. Many social scientists dislike Sorokin with enthusiasm; for the same reason, and with the same enthusiasm, many historians dislike Toynbee. Indeed the superficial difference in background and language between these two men is overshadowed by their fundamental similarity. If Toynbee is the Isaiah, Sorokin is the Amos of our transitional civilization.

How does Toynbee get that way? How does he know what he seems to know? One of Toynbee's significant contributions, as yet unsung, is his two-level epistemology. He breaks completely with the scientific method as the exclusive avenue to truth, regarding it as a worthy method only in the study of the subhuman. Man is free and intelligent; he may become a member of an insect society only through the denial of his humanity. The machinery of life can be studied by the scientific method, not the ideas which alone give meaning to matter, the values by which men live. "Why should we suppose that the scientific method of thought, a method which has been devised for thinking about Inanimate Nature, should be applicable to historical thought, which is a study of living creatures and indeed of human beings?"² The scientific method in the study of human beings is the "industrialization of historical thought."³ If the *pathetic fallacy* is to treat inanimate objects as though they were living, the *apathetic fallacy* is to treat living creatures as though they were inanimate. "There exists a human faculty . . . which insists, not upon looking at Inanimate Nature, but upon feeling Life and feeling it as a whole."⁴ In short, Toynbee's epistemology is subjective as well as empirical, a two-level approach which becomes three levels when thought, quickened by faith, passes over into Revelation. At this point both Sorokin and Toynbee break with the provincial one-level epistemology of the past fifty years. Man knows by intuition, by meditation, by thought, by direct apprehension, as well as by empirical investigation, the endeavor to see things in *relation*

² *A Study of History*, Vol. I. London: Oxford University Press, 1935, p. 7.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

as well as the endeavor to see things *in particular*. This revolution in epistemology has put the simon-pure empiricists in the position of obstructionists and reactionaries. The endeavor "to see life steadily and see it whole" has come back into its own.

The general public thinks of Toynbee as a dealer only in macrocosms. On this account it may strike the reader that this essay should begin with Toynbee's view of society. Yet in Volume Five Toynbee acknowledges that he might as well have begun with the Microcosm, Man.⁵ The problems of civilizations and souls are similar. "A loss of self-determination is the ultimate criterion of breakdown. . . . A progress towards self-determination is the criterion of growth."⁶

From first page to last in Toynbee's works, man is the center of interest. In the growth and breakdown of civilizations, man is the variable.

The schism in the Human Body Social . . . is an experience which is collective and therefore superficial. Its significance lies in its being the outward visible sign of an inward spiritual rift; and this spiritual rift is riven in human souls, for, among all the almost infinitely various manifestations of Human Nature, the Soul alone is capable of being the subject of spiritual experiences and the author of spiritual acts. A schism in the souls of human beings will be found at the heart of any schism that reveals itself on the surface of the society which is the common ground of these human actors' respective fields of activity.⁷

In all situations "the greatest danger to Man is Man."⁸ Man is a paradox of dust and divinity, a creature of necessity and freedom. This idea is everywhere present in Toynbee's volumes, but is most precisely formulated in *Civilization on Trial*, Chapter 13. The soul is not only *in history*; when the soul is regarded as exclusively within the flux, the state crushes the individual, society submerges personality. The soul is not only *outside history*; when the soul is considered as exclusively other-worldly, this world becomes a valueless illusion, *maya*; the here-and-now is regarded as a mere parade ground of preparation for heaven; the world and the flesh have no rights of their own; God becomes a loveless Tyrant, not the God of Christianity. The soul is both *in* and *outside* history; this world is one province in the kingdom of God, not the whole Kingdom, and not the most important province. Man is both a sensory and a super-sensory reality, as Sorokin reiterates. Empirical studies are limited to the sensory; subjective studies include the supersensory.

⁵ *A Study of History*, Vol. V. London: Oxford University Press, 1939, p. 375-6.

⁶ *A Study of History*, Vol. IV. London: Oxford University Press, 1939, p. 133.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 376.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 121.

"The action which is the theme of human history is the action of individual human beings on that common ground of their respective fields of action which we call a society."⁹ Man is the center of the drama, and "in human affairs there is a net of Necessity as well as a breath of Freedom."¹⁰ "As human beings, we are endowed with . . . freedom of choice, and we cannot shuffle off our responsibility upon the shoulders of God or nature. We must shoulder it ourselves."¹¹

But Toynbee's analysis of human nature moves on from the simple paradox of necessity and freedom to man's ethical problem. He possesses both good and evil. His freedom is good. His capacity for creativity is good. His capacity for fellowship is good. He can measure, he can think, he can pray. All these abilities are good. By withdrawal from society into regenerating communion with God he can become a creative personality. But there is evil in man as well; he may surrender to necessity as well as struggle for self-transcendence; he may surrender his humanity. He may idolize ephemeral institutions and obstruct successful responses to new challenges. In short, man is a sinner.

The sinner's bane is a Divine inability to continue to use as an instrument of creation a creature that has insisted upon alienating itself from the life of its Creator. The sinful soul comes to grief because, so long as it wills to sin, God's Grace is unable to inspire and inform it.¹²

If man could somehow manage to sin only in private, much harm would be prevented. Unfortunately, man's good and evil deeply affect the whole of society. Man is capable of large-scale destruction.

The institutions of War and Class are social reflexions of the seamy side of human nature—or what the theologians call original sin—in the kind of society that we call civilizations. These social effects of individual human sinfulness have not been abolished by the recent portentous advance in our technological "know-how," but they have not been left unaffected by it either. Not having been abolished, they have been enormously keyed up, like the rest of human life, in respect of their physical potency. Class has now become capable of irrevocably disintegrating Society, and War of annihilating the entire human race.¹³

But if man has power to destroy, he has as well ability to build. He possesses a capacity for creativity, for fellowship with God. If "a Do-as-you-like, left to himself, is bound to degenerate into a Gorilla,"¹⁴ another

⁹ *A Study of History*, Vol. III. Oxford University Press, 1935, p. 230.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 35.

¹¹ *Civilization On Trial*. Oxford University Press, 1948, p. 39.

¹² *A Study of History*, Vol. IV, p. 256.

¹³ *Civilization On Trial*, p. 24.

¹⁴ *A Study of History*, Vol. I, p. 30.

personality, faced with a difficult challenge, may rise to the stature of a savior.

Growth means that the growing personality or civilization tends to become its own environment and its own challenger and its own field of action. In other words, the criterion of growth is progress towards self-determination; and progress towards self-determination is a prosaic formula for describing the miracle by which Life enters into its Kingdom. . . . In the souls of certain individual human beings, a new spiritual species—a veritable Superman—emerges. The mystically illumined Personality evidently stands to ordinary Human Nature as civilizations stand to primitive human societies.¹⁵

It is this individual spiritual progress in this world for which we pray when we say, "Thy will be done in Earth as it is in Heaven." It is for the salvation that is open to all men of good will—pagan as well as Christian, primitive as well as civilized—who make the most of their spiritual opportunities on Earth, however narrow these opportunities may be, that we pray when we say, "Thy Kingdom come."¹⁶

SOCIETY

"Man . . . is essentially a social animal, in the sense that social life is a condition which the evolution of Man out of Sub-Man presupposes, and without which that evolution could not conceivably have taken place."¹⁷ Man as the creator of civilizations, as the Bible suggests, is approximately six thousand years old. But Sub-Man preceded Man by at least three hundred thousand years. In any case, whether primitive or civilized, man is a social animal.

A society, however, is merely a theater of operations. "Societies are not, in fact, living organisms in any sense."¹⁸ Spengler made two mistakes: he considered societies living organisms, and he assumed a hopeless determinism. Societies are to be understood as "intelligible fields of historical study. . . . They are the common ground between the respective fields of activity of a number of individual human beings who are themselves living organisms but who cannot conjure up a giant in their own image out of the intersection of their own shadows."¹⁹ A society progresses as its members, in the aggregate, offer successful responses to difficult challenges from the human or the physical environment, led by creative minorities, themselves set in motion by creative personalities. The same society retrogresses when creative minorities are frustrated by dominant minorities, when social schism follows schism in the soul.

Societies become articulated into parochial sovereign states, creative or competitive, natural or artificial. The strength of the state lies ulti-

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 216.

¹⁶ *Civilization On Trial*, pp. 251-252.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 218.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 12.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

mately in the fact of human interdependence.²⁰ In our own society, Western Christian Civilization, the two ecumenical forces of Industrialism and Democracy, poured like new wine into the old bottles of parochial sovereign states, have produced the enormity of fratricidal warfare in which whole peoples, and for exalted reasons, seek to destroy one another. Nationalist states obstruct the mutual interdependence of mankind: they are stubborn obstacles athwart the path of ecumenicity; their dominant minorities stifle creative responses to the desperate challenge of economic and political peace. Militarism, which is bureaucracy rather than creativity, is the deadly instrument whereby uncreative dominant minorities seek to perpetuate their power.

A declining society is apt to hasten the day of its dissolution by squandering its diminishing store of vital energy in material performances on an excessive scale, not so much out of wanton megalomania as in a vain effort to give the lie to its own unacknowledged but agonizing consciousness of incompetence and failure and doom.²¹

Militarism . . . has been by far the commonest cause of the breakdowns of civilization, during the four or five millennia which have witnessed the score or so of breakdowns that are on record up to the present date. Militarism breaks a civilization down by causing the local states into which the society is articulated to collide with one another in destructive internecine conflicts. In this suicidal process, the entire social fabric becomes fuel to feed the devouring flame in the brazen bosom of Molech.²²

In short, breakdown is finally traceable to "a loss of creative power in the souls of the creative individuals, or the creative minorities, who have been the leaders of any given civilization at any given stage in the history of its growth."²³

The battle narrows to a conflict between the ecumenical and the provincial mind, the mind which recognizes interdependence and the mind which assumes a self-sufficiency it cannot justify. Put differently, stability wars with creativity. A basic Christian idea is Brotherhood, transcending all forms of provinciality. Over against the idea of brotherhood is the philosophers' idea of caste.

In their condonation of caste, in their penchant toward specialization, and in their passion for establishing an invincible equilibrium at any price, the Athenian philosophers of the fourth century B.C. show themselves docile pupils of the Spartan statesmen of the sixth. . . . Not happiness and not progress, but stability, is the Alpha and Omega of the Athenian philosophers' social creed.²⁴

²⁰ I Cor. 12:14-16, 19-20.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 154.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 150.

²³ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 5.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 93, 96.

But stability characterizes the insect mind. "Instinct predominates in the insect mind: intelligence in the mind of Man." Arrested development in a civilization, the beginning of decline, "may be explained . . . in psychological terms as a mental reversion from the human towards the insect type of mental rhythm: from the blundering but progressive mobility of reason to the infallible but inflexible rigidity of instinct."²⁵

Our own immediate future seems dominated by two giant antagonists; and the challenge of One World, an economic and political necessity, calls loudly for the creative exertion of the human intelligence. We must make a successful response, or perish.

We have invented the atomic weapon in a world partitioned between two supremely great powers: and the United States and the Soviet Union stand respectively for two opposing ideologies whose antithesis is so extreme that, as it stands, it seems irreconcilable. Salvation perhaps lies, as so often, in finding a middle way. In politics, this golden mean would be something that was neither the unrestricted sovereignty of parochial states nor the unrelieved despotism of a centralized world government: in economics it would be something that was neither unrestricted private enterprise nor unmitigated socialism. As one middle-aged middle-class West European observer sees the world today, salvation cometh neither from the East nor from the West.²⁶

Multiplied millions of civilizations may yet rise and fall in the millennia ahead. If one civilization fails, another may gain the goal of human endeavor. If other races fail, the Negro race, which has not yet achieved a civilization of its own, may outdistance its competitors and establish the City of God. "The African Negritos are said by our anthropologists to have an unexpectedly pure and lofty conception of the nature of God and of God's relation to man. They might be able to give mankind a fresh start."²⁷ On the other hand, the "extreme possibility is that we might succeed in exterminating the whole human race,"—but the ants and the bees might eventually develop intellectual understanding.

The effort to create a new manifestation of life . . . seldom or never succeeds at the first attempt. Creation is not so easy an enterprise as that. It wins its ultimate successes through a process of trial and error; and accordingly the failure of previous experiments, so far from dooming subsequent experiments to fail in their turn in the same way, actually offers them their opportunity of achieving success through the wisdom that can be gained from suffering. . . .

What shall we do to be saved? In politics, establish a constitutional cooperative system of world government. In economics, find working compromises . . . between free enterprise and socialism. In the life of the spirit, put the secular superstructure back onto religious foundations. . . .²⁸

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

²⁶ *Civilization On Trial*, pp. 27-28.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

God

"Religion, after all, is the serious business of the human race."²⁹

On all sides thinking men have rediscovered the existential dilemma; either the adventure of man is meaningless, or God has played the largest role in history. At my interview with Mr. and Mrs. Toynbee, he said: "The society of which man is a part includes God as well as human personalities, and therefore includes also an unbending righteous Judgment, and a universal redemptive Will, set above all action, both social and personal."

At the very outset, the genesis of a civilization involves an interaction between responding man and challenging environment.

Any kind of climate and topography is capable of serving as an environment for the genesis of a civilization if the necessary miracle is performed by some interaction between Environment and Race, some encounter between the Devil and God. That is the plot of the *Book of Job* and the plot of Goethe's *Faust*. Is it, perhaps, the plot of Life and the plot of History?³⁰

In short, "Creation is the outcome of an encounter. . . . Genesis is a function of interaction."³¹ It is God who accepts the encounter, and his long-range purpose is neither cruelty, nor Self-glorification, but Love. God did not accept a wager he could not lose; even he embarked upon the enterprise of creation at great personal risk. Yet,

The Devil is bound to lose the wager, not because he has been cheated by God, but because he has overreached himself. He has played into God's hands because he would not or could not deny himself the malicious satisfaction of forcing God's hand. Knowing that God would not or could not refuse the wager if it were offered, the Devil did not observe that God was hoping, silently but eagerly, that the offer would be made. In his jubilation at obtaining an opportunity to ruin one of God's choicest creatures, the Devil did not foresee that he would be giving God Himself an opportunity to renew the whole work of creation. And so God's purpose is fulfilled through the Devil's instrumentality and in the Devil's despite.³²

Less heroic historians cry, "Mythology!" But Toynbee replies: "Mythology is an intuitive form of apprehending and expressing universal truths."³³

Historians are confronted with an apparently irreconcilable choice: to assume that life is cyclical and meaningless, or that it is in motion toward a distant objective. Toynbee insists that the conflict is not, as a matter of fact, irreconcilable. Processes in themselves purposeless may participate in an over-all movement toward the goal of human endeavor.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

³⁰ *A Study of History*, Vol. I, pp. 269-270.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 299.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 284-285.

³³ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 259.

After all, if a vehicle is to move forward on a course which its driver has set, it must be borne along on wheels that turn monotonously round and round. While civilizations rise and fall and, in falling, give rise to others, some purposeful enterprise, higher than theirs, may all the time be making headway, and, in a divine plan, the learning that comes through suffering caused by the failures of civilizations may be the sovereign means of progress.³⁴

God is to be understood as Father, Ruler, and End, for he works with a purpose, and his nature is Love. Yet his government is not at the expense of human freedom. He offers his aid to challenged mankind; man, in the freedom he has received from God, makes the terrible choice. "A sensational scientific discovery gave birth to a fallacious philosophy of Determinism which has captivated the intellect of one civilization after another and is not quite discredited yet after a run of nearly 2,700 years."³⁵

The ultimate solution of the conflict between Brotherhood and Tribalism transcends the human level.

The Brotherhood of Man presupposes the Fatherhood of God—a truth which involves the converse proposition that, if the divine father of the human family is ever left out of the reckoning, there is no possibility of forging any alternative bond of purely human texture which will avail by itself to hold Mankind together. The only society that is capable of embracing the whole of Mankind is a super-human *Civitas Dei*; and the conception of a society that embraces all Mankind and yet nothing but Mankind is an academic chimera.³⁶

However large its area on earth, Man's universe cannot give his spirit room to breathe unless it also extends from earth to heaven.

The God of Israel, both provincial and exclusive, overcame his "live and let live" Syriac competitors, because he was a living God, not a philosophical abstraction. The living God overcame an abstract Zoroastrian Ahuramazda and an abstract Stoic Zeus and an abstract Constantinian Sol Invictus and an abstract Neoplatonic Helios. Likewise the Syriac Mithras, the Egyptian Isis, and the Hittite Cybele—all willing to compromise—were conquered in the Hellenistic world by the Christian God. But the jealousy of Yahweh and his Son has more than survival value. "Its transcendent value lies in the disconcerting fact that a divinity who is credited by his worshippers with this spirit of uncompromising self-assertion proves to be the only medium through which the profound and therefore elusive truth of the unity of God has been firmly grasped hitherto by human souls."³⁷

Archaism seeks to force history backward on the terrestrial plane;

³⁴ *Civilization On Trial*, p. 15.

³⁵ *A Study of History*, Vol. V, p. 57.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 9.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

Futurism seeks conversely to force history forward on the same plane. Detachment, the device of the philosophers, would withdraw from this world to another which excludes it. Transfiguration, the gift of the higher religions, with their culmination in Christianity, perceives a spiritual world, other than, yet embracing and penetrating, this world; able, when recognized and served, to turn any city of chaos into a City of God. "God's purpose is other than, and better than, Man's own."³⁸ A human Messiah is not enough. God himself must condescend to play the part, which he alone can effectively play, of serving his people as their savior and their king. The philosophy of detachment had to be eclipsed by the mystery of transfiguration. "The Hinayana makes way for the Mahayana, Stoicism for Christianity, the arhat for the Bodhisattva, the sage for the saint."³⁹

The philosopher is completely nonplussed at the notion of a God who has not even had to take the trouble to withdraw from an unsatisfactory World, because He is completely independent of it by virtue of His very divinity, but who nevertheless deliberately enters into the World, and subjects Himself there to the utmost agony that God or Man can undergo, for the sake of a race of beings of an immeasurably inferior order. "God so loved the World that He gave His only begotten Son?" That is the last word in folly from the standpoint of a seeker after Detachment.⁴⁰

The kingdom of God, incommensurable with any kingdom founded or ruled by a world-conqueror, is a spiritual reality, at all times present in this world, in a supramundane dimension. Precisely this is the meaning of the Descent of the Holy Ghost.⁴¹ The Church is the middle term between the next world and this world. Externally, the Church is the Body of Christ; internally, it is the Presence of the Spirit.

A generation or two ago every effort was made to escape the pivotal Christ; the objective was an all-inclusive religious syncretism. Herculean exertion sought to put asunder Christian Civilization and its Author. That endeavor is now seen to be archaic, unhistoric, and futile.

How in fact can God's will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven? . . . In the Christian conception of the Godhead His transcendent aspect is displayed in God the Father and His immanent aspect in God the Holy Ghost; but the distinctive and also crucial feature of the Christian Faith is the doctrine that the Godhead is not a Duality but a Trinity in Unity, and that in His aspect as God the Son the other two aspects are unified in a Person who, in virtue of this mystery, is as accessible to the human heart as He is incomprehensible to the human understanding. In the person of Christ Jesus—Very God yet also Very Man—the Divine Society and the mundane society have a common member who in the order of This World

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

is born into the rank of the Proletariat and dies the death of a malefactor, while in the order of the Other World He is the King of God's Kingdom—and a King who is God Himself and not God's less-than-divine deputy.⁴²

The human wayfarer who still finds himself a sojourner in this world is not on that account beyond the pale of the other world but is traveling all the time within the domain of the kingdom of God and is at liberty to live as a citizen of this omnipresent commonwealth here and now, if he is willing with all his heart to pay allegiance to Christ the King and to take upon himself those obligations of citizenship which Christ has consecrated by voluntarily fulfilling them in person. This entry into the kingdom of God is the second birth.

It is through the church that grace is mediated to men, and the eventual establishment of a universal church upon this earth, though it would not affect man's tendency to original sin or his capacity for salvation, would increase the availability of liberation.

On such a view, this world would not be a spiritual exercise ground beyond the pale of the Kingdom of God; it would be a province of the Kingdom—one province only, and not the most important one, yet one which had the same absolute value as the rest, and therefore one in which spiritual action could, and would, be fully significant and worthwhile; the one thing of manifest and abiding value in a world in which all other things are vanity.⁴³

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 162-163.

⁴³ *Civilization On Trial*, p. 263.

Of
of o
Prof
on t
twen
hope
ening
circu
orien
centr
imize
age a
endan
relate
iety."
been
streng
imper
and t
have
Cor
heede
instinc
public
from
Joseph
about
ism, an
For th

Sy
Tutor
treats h
Schlesin
Co., 19

Mr. Schlesinger's *Vital Center*

SYDNEY E. AHLSTROM

ONE of the minor tragedies of the present time is that most descriptions of our crisis have become clichés. It was, therefore, very fortunate that Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., should have written a terse volume on the "politics of freedom." *The Vital Center* is a statement of "mid-twentieth-century liberalism," an outlook that has been shaped by "the hope of the New Deal, the exposure of the Soviet Union, and by the deepening of our knowledge of man." More explicitly it is a study of the circumstances that now demand a center position between the business-oriented politics of Calvin Coolidge and the politics of the total planner. Of central importance for this program is Mr. Schlesinger's desire to maximize freedom within the limitations of the social needs of an industrial age and to improve the general welfare to the extent that freedom is not endangered. All of these considerations of public policy, however, he relates directly to the concept of Western man adrift in an "age of anxiety." Accordingly, the irrationality and depravity of man, which have been traditional justifications for authoritarianism, are here used to strengthen the case for democracy. It is also in this context of despair, impersonality, and conflict that he outlines the past attempts of the Right and the Left to cope with the problems which industrialism and urbanism have created.

Conservatives have failed, by his analysis, because they have too often heeded the counsels of the business mind and yielded to the acquisitive instincts of the "plutocracy." They have not displayed the concern for the public weal that has characterized leaders of the "aristocratic" tradition from Alexander Hamilton to Theodore Roosevelt. Moreover, following Joseph A. Schumpeter's thesis, he sees capitalism itself to be bringing about its own undoing. The failure of the Left, the nature of totalitarianism, and particularly the "case of Russia" are given more extended analysis. For these purposes Mr. Schlesinger abandons the traditional device of

SYDNEY E. AHLSTROM, M.A., is a Teaching Fellow in History and Resident Tutor in Kirkland House at Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts. He treats here of "liberalism's moral crisis," as illustrated in the book by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Vital Center: The Politics of Freedom*, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1949.

polarizing Right and Left on a linear scale, and uses instead the diagram of a full circle in terms of which divergences that begin as conservative versus liberal or radical versus reactionary finally meet, as Communist and Fascist, 180 degrees around from the "vital center" on a common ground of violence and terror. Mr. Schlesinger takes no chances that the absolute tragedy of totalitarianism will be underestimated, nor does he have any doubts about the impossibility of co-operating with Communists or fellow-traveling progressives whom he terms Doughfaces—"democratic men with totalitarian principles."

Affirming the value of freedom, welcoming the aid of conservatives more than doughfaces (because they value freedom more), and recognizing the well-nigh insuperable problems that confront sinful and erring man, the book is a summons to liberal action, not a blueprint for Utopia. In foreign policy, Mr. Schlesinger asks for active support of the non-Communist Left wherever it is found and world-wide action in behalf of freedom. Domestically, he emphasizes the responsibilities of government for maintaining freedom, extending its social services, and restoring the sense of community. Although the details and institutional aspects of these proposals could hardly be charted in so brief a compass, the book is a comprehensive and compelling formulation for radical democratic men with libertarian principles.

I

This essay, however, is not concerned with the program of action which the book outlines, but rather with its theoretical and presuppositional structure. Although Mr. Schlesinger has stated in his Foreword that "novel or startling political doctrines" have not been set forth, he does present a very considerable theoretical foundation for his program. These aspects are especially important because the book has been very widely read and because it is a "report on the fundamental enterprise of re-examination and self-criticism" which virtually a whole generation of liberals has undergone in the last decade. It is, therefore, an important case study. Despite the wide acceptance of the outlook presented in this volume, it is my conviction that a long-term basis for hope has not been presented; and that the church must not only concern itself with this liberal analysis in general, but conduct the re-examination and reaffirmation of doctrine that will give substance and vitality to such a program and to our collective hopes.

The *Leitmotiv* of this book is moral crisis and the flight from freedom of modern man. Its basic demand is for recharging the moral re-

sources of man. This is in itself a departure from the cant of most American liberalism, and appearing thus in what is *primarily* a discussion of public policy, it actually confers on the book a certain pioneering status. Nor has Mr. Schlesinger stopped with the mere announcement of a moral problem.

In diagnosing our ills, he has presented an interpretation of the human predicament which has in it much that is Pauline, although it has been phrased in the terminology of psycho-socio-economic theory. The message is an old one, a hard one, and a tough one. With a certain Calvinistic fervor it exposes the great liberal fallacy about the nature of man. Though often couched in terms of frustration, it says with the Apostle:

Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.

For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. (Romans 7:17-19)

This approach constitutes a fundamental revision of the ideas of man's benign goodness and his inexorable progress to a kingdom of heaven on earth.

Again, in finding the basis for man's anxiety in the social complexities that leave man homeless and rootless, without sense of communion or brotherhood, Mr. Schlesinger suggests a New Testament theme. To be sure, there is no citation of Holy Writ and he is not trying to bolster dogmas relating to the Mystical Body of Christ; but as one reads in page after page of the lonely, torn, unintegrated mass-man that industrial society has created, one sees a new richness in the words of St. Paul:

. . . . God hath tempered the body together, that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. (I Cor. 12:24-26)

None of my remarks which follow could detract from the value of this insight.

As will soon be made clear, however, Mr. Schlesinger has not written a biblical interpretation of our predicament. Nor has he allowed the profoundest spirit of the Hellenic tradition to inform his basic conceptions. The resulting philosophical orientation, therefore, seems inadequate to the needs imposed by present-day pressures. It is entirely possible, nonetheless, that a few of the following criticisms would be unnecessary if Mr. Schlesinger had depended less on a psycho-sociological notational system,

and if it had been possible for him to amplify some of the theoretical problems and to define more adequately certain concepts. With these reservations in mind, and from a point of view which is essentially evangelical, though eschewing the anticlassicism and antirationalism of much modern orthodox thought, a more detailed explication of what seem to be the shortcomings of Mr. Schlesinger's analysis can be considered.

The reader is not left long to doubt that the basis of the politics of freedom is essentially relativistic. Liberalism, we are told, must not be disdainful of the "pragmatic compromise"; there is the familiar insistence on the overarching importance of "results" as the final test of the validity of our ideas; and we are not spared the deprecation of logic common to emergent philosophies from Emerson to James. Mr. Schlesinger also commits himself to a social interpretation of history. "The state and the factory are inexorable";¹ James Madison's statement of the economic interpretation of history (before Marx was born) is applauded as "magistral"; and Joseph de Maistre and Edmund Burke are praised not so much for the articles of their faiths as for their insights into the function of social myths—Paretos before their time, as it were. We hear of the "manic-depressive cycle" of American business, the "capitalist death-wish," and the "compulsive mass escape from freedom [of industrial man] into the deep, womb-dark sea."² We are bidden, finally, to have hope that "cultural pluralism" and "spontaneous group activity" will satisfy "those irrational sentiments once mobilized by religion" and, thus supplying "outlets for the variegated emotions of man, . . . restore meaning to democratic life."³

This is a capitulation to that very approach which Mr. Schlesinger criticized in such strong terms while reviewing a recent study of the psychology of the American soldier.⁴ The review filed a protest against the methods, language, and pretensions of the "Social Sciences." It may be suggested, however, that were his animadversions taken literally, a very considerable portion of this book would suffer the maledictions its author himself pronounced. One can readily agree with him about the importance of "American study of village sociology" in problems of world reconstruction; but in the present theoretical framework the democratic idea of freedom is seriously vitiated and individual dignity in either the classical or the Judeo-Christian sense tends to lose its meaning. These matters must, therefore, be considered briefly.

¹ *The Vital Center*, p. 7.

² p. 244.

³ p. 253.

⁴ *Partisan Review*, August, 1949, 952-56.

Although not as a direct result of this social interpretation of man, the ideal of freedom tends to become a muscular rather than a rational concept. Democracy in the Western tradition has always been linked inseparably with the idea of free man reasoning. The emphasis is now changed. Democracy becomes not a reasoning faith but "a fighting faith."⁵ We are given frequent citations to the effect that praiseworthy aristocrats have not failed to love the sword whereas plutocrats have preferred "tranquillity." Without questioning for one moment the need to defend our heritage, one can wonder how this view differs from the somewhat less than profound message of Carl Sandburg's recent novel (which, for that matter, reiterates much of Walt Whitman's demand for "a large and resolute breed of men"): have faith in continuity and struggle—so it has been and ever shall be. The problem of freedom, however, is related more directly to the idea of individual dignity; and here Mr. Schlesinger's social interpretation is revealed again. The "essential strength of democracy," he admits, lies in its "startling insight into the value of the individual"; but in the same paragraph he asserts that "individualism derives freely from the community,"⁶ Freedom, too, it is said, "has acquired its dynamism from communion in action."⁷

Yet there is another dimension in which *The Vital Center* must be evaluated, because it has been supplemented by the author's appreciation for the philosophical temper that can be traced from Pascal, Dostoevsky, and Kierkegaard to Sartre and Niebuhr. All of these men have made the predicament of the individual a crucial fact and each of them, judging by frequent citations and references, has informed Mr. Schlesinger's present conclusions. We must "strengthen the human will," he says, following Albert Camus. "The reform of institutions can never be a substitute for the reform of man."⁸ "The death pallor" will come over free society "unless it can recharge the deepest sources of its moral energy."⁹ This insight, however, is insufficient in itself. In fact, study of the combined effect of these views of freedom, the individual, and our ethical problem reveals the deepest tragedy of Mr. Schlesinger's analysis.

This tragedy lies in the fact that the value of his trenchant statement of our crisis is doubly canceled by the contradictions brought on by his sociologism. On the page after his affirmation of the anterior need for the "reform of man" he asserts that "the hope for free society lies . . .

⁵ *The Vital Center*, ch. XI.

⁶ p. 248.

⁷ p. 251.

⁸ p. 250.

⁹ p. 246.

in the kind of men *it creates*." (Italics mine.) Furthermore, the goal is shifted: it is not moral man but "emotional and psychological stability" that is wanted. Man is "*instinctively* anti-totalitarian." (Italics mine.) What he lacks is "profounder emotional resources" and effective group activity.¹⁰

Now nobody would dismiss the anxiety and loneliness of modern, industrial man or deny that he would be happier if he were less lonely. He is often made happier even now by joining the Rotarians. He would be happier still if by some miracle the medieval village (or even the nineteenth-century American town!) could be made a much more significant factor in the total social pattern. To the extent that practical corrective measures are possible they should be undertaken. But these considerations are *in the strictest sense of the word peripheral*.

In the first place, this idealization of "rich emotional life," whether in context or out, seems deficient in explicitness, and insofar as it is a poetic summons to a stronger *Volksgeist* it is actually dangerous. But more important, it overlooks the central issue. Human dignity is our real concern and this rests on other things than the pragmatic value of an erect, intelligent animal. The insights of our "classical and religious past" must be consulted. Yet, except for occasional references, Mr. Schlesinger seems to place more confidence in social psychoanalysis. This resort is not entirely successful, for it is never made clear why the totalitarian methods of providing "emotional resources" are *categorically* wrong. Stalin has appealed to those "irrational sentiments once mobilized by religion," promising a way, a truth, and a life, complete with *parousia* and paradise. He has integrated his converts socially: cells, collective farms, and a nationalistic mission. There seems to be no shortage of "group activity." Nor is there a love of tranquillity! And the conclusion drawn is that ultimately this abolition of freedom is wrong only because it will not work.¹¹ Due to the nature of Mr. Schlesinger's philosophy of the individual, the crucial weapon is lacking.

What *are* the "spontaneous sources of community," the "springs of social brotherhood" which we must tap again? If there is something in man which unfreedom thwarts even if it could remove his anxiety, we must define it. Moreover, a moral crisis is a demand for ethics—not just a choice between "conflict and stagnation."¹² We must turn reason to the task of

¹⁰ *The Vital Center*, pp. 246f.

¹¹ Chap. V, *passim*; 247.

¹² One thinks of the declaration of one of Heidegger's students: *Ich bin entschlossen—ich weiss nur nichts wozu!* (I am determined—only I know not to what!)

erecting a logical framework of principle. Neither man, the will of man, nor society is going to be made moral by minimizing the frustrations brought on by urbanism! This merely suggests a new optimistic fallacy. There is more than a simple faith in progress that needs to be revised. There will be no "rededication to concrete democratic ends," no "revival of the *élan* of democracy," no "resurgence of the democratic faith"¹³ until man, rational man, defines the ends of democracy in terms that do justice to his rationality and to his dignity. We must not think that illogical reasoning is going to "get results." Using every concept and technique that the sciences can give us, we must try to transcend ourselves and our culture in search of what Plato called the "outline of virtue." This means that we must direct our intellectual energies to defining what Mr. Schlesinger calls "the values which distinguish free society from totalitarianism." A check-list of political freedoms is insufficient. It is also essential that we do not blur our responsibilities by suggesting, as he does, that "the advocate of free society defines himself by telling what he is against."¹⁴ We cannot let it be said of us as Henry Adams said of another generation of liberals: they considered the intellectual difficulties in their path to be unessential because they were insuperable.¹⁵

II

No one can deny Mr. Schlesinger's insistence that these are times requiring bravery. But one is reminded of Cicero's advice to his son: "It is impossible for the man to be brave who pronounces pain to be the greatest evil, or temperate who proposes pleasure as the highest good."¹⁶ We cannot scorn the rationalists or deprecate reason: there is too much glory in the "elevated and unsubdued mind." This liberating force of Hellenism the modern liberal needs in his search for principle and for his proper estimate of man.

Yet there is another response to the need for bravery, and the admonition of St. Paul imposes itself: "Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand." (Eph. 6:13.) It is true that Mr. Schlesinger, in his critique of Encyclopedist or Social Darwinist optimism, has sounded a Pauline note. But he has not emphasized the paradox of man's predica-

¹³ *The Vital Center*, p. 251.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 245f.

¹⁵ *History of the United States of America during the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison*. New York, 1890-91, IX, p. 186.

¹⁶ *Moral Duties of Mankind*, Book I.

ment and his anxiety *regardless* of social adjustment. Nevertheless his exposition points to the fact, and understanding the fact we can resort to the wisdom of our heritage.

Jacques Maritain has written that "democracy needs . . . evangelical ferment in order to be realized and in order to endure."¹⁷ This implies a faith in man—to use our best metaphor—as created in the image of God. It implies that sin involves more than Aristotle's Punch-and-Judy show between reason and the appetites. It implies that the dignity of man is, in the last analysis, a spiritual truth. "We are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights." They are really rights: no man and no government can legitimately take them away.¹⁸ Democracy, as Bergson said, is evangelical. Without the inspiration of Christianity, it is just another formula—a reasonable formula, but ultimately caught in a paradox that only faith can resolve.

This, it seems to me, is the real sermon of our times, and modern political thought must be invested with its meaning. If the center holds, it will not be because men grounded their hopes in ephemeral psychic satisfactions, but because they searched for and found principle in the universe. If we fail—and we may fail—we must face the judgment of Hosea: "for the Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land. . . . Therefore shall the land mourn, and everyone that dwelleth therein shall languish." (Hosea 4:1-3.)

¹⁷ *Christianity and Democracy*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944, p. 61.

¹⁸ As Mr. Schlesinger says in his recent article on "The Causes of the Civil War," slavery was "a betrayal of our Christian and democratic tradition." *Partisan Review*, October, 1949, 979.

P
Ne
is r
crin
udi
hel
from
und
men

com
chap
topi
pris
sing
plac
conc
achi
of e
catic
ping
who
tax
cons
way

ticul
find

trati
tion
and
respo

"When Saw We Thee in Prison?"

ROBERT A. PRESTON

I

PRISON EXPERIENCES ARE MENTIONED frequently in the New Testament. Such mention is rare in today's religious literature. It is more respectable to be imprisoned for one's beliefs than for a common crime, but the imprisoned leaders of early Christianity did not act prejudiced toward their fellow inmates. Rather, they showed a deep and helpful interest. Even today there are people in prison who take comfort from reading scriptural incidents which express this attitude of concern and understanding. These prisoners also wonder why contemporary church members and leaders do not show the same sort of attitude.

It would be possible to make several half-true digs at some imaginary complacent churchman for his lack of active interest in prisoners. Prison chaplains, past and present, are inflammable on this and many related topics. Perhaps church people have a special sin of complacency and prison chaplains have a special sin of irritability. Be that as it may, no single group is to be blamed for crime, negligence of social duty, complacency, punitive attitudes, stagnation among penologists, obsolete legal concepts, nor all the suffering these involve. Fixing blame, moreover, achieves little in either Christian or penological circles. The case history of each prisoner leads back into a vast web of personal and social complications. One who would truly understand and help must begin by dropping all preconceived ideas and looking carefully at the human beings who now occupy the prisons. We who actively support prisons with our tax money and approve their existence and program by vote or by silent consent can benefit by knowing those who are affected in the most direct way.

Nearest at hand are the jails. Assuming optimistically that a particular jail is not shockingly dirty nor vermin-infested, one will probably find that it is crowded beyond its intended capacity. Many of the inmates

ROBERT A. PRESTON, M.A., is Chaplain of the Winter Veterans Administration Hospital, Topeka, Kansas. He was formerly Chaplain of the U. S. Detention Headquarters, New York; the U. S. Penitentiary, Terre Haute, Indiana; and U. S. Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia. He finds that the field of the church's responsibility to prisoners is largely unexplored.

have not been convicted of any crime. They are on trial or are awaiting trial. A few of these may be held incommunicado for rather brief periods for reasons which are hard to ascertain. Another group consists of those who have been tried and convicted and are awaiting transfer to another institution to serve sentences which are longer than a year, more or less, which constitutes a "jail sentence." Being on trial or awaiting trial or transfer is always a situation of special anxiety. Most of the remaining inmates are serving fairly short sentences within the jail. A few are under observation for mental instability or awaiting space in a mental hospital.

The treatment of prisoners in a jail ranges from just and human consideration in a few jails to considerable neglect or even brutality in others. It is hard to learn the true conditions in a given jail without expert study. The wisest and best-intentioned jail administrators find it extremely difficult to establish a regimen which furthers the best interests of inmates in a lasting way. The turnover is rapid, contacts are governed by urgent necessities, and prisoners seldom put aside any of the defensive shell which is erected against the short-time stress of the situation. Few indeed could be found by the chaplain in a jail to meet the description by Oscar Wilde:

Ah! happy they whose hearts can break
 And peace of pardon win!
 How else may man make straight his plan
 And cleanse his soul from Sin?
 How else but through a broken heart
 May Lord Christ enter in? ¹

No prison program, whether in a jail or a longer-term institution, can be reformed and properly adjusted once and for all time. The most meager humanitarian policies can exist only on a foundation of vigilant public concern which in turn rests on a constant process of education, selection of leadership, and advancement with the growth of knowledge and skills in prison work. The influences which affect the jail prisoner cover only a brief period of time but they come at a crucial moment when a day may seem "as a thousand years" to a prisoner. He may come to significant decisions at this time, if given the opportunity and encouragement. But the odds against wholesome possibilities are many. If the prisoner has within himself a motivation which is strong enough to surmount the influence of other prisoners and of inept personnel, he may use the occasional

¹ Oscar Wilde, "The Ballad of Reading Gaol." *The Home Book of Verse*, selected and arranged by Benton Egbert Stevenson, 1940, Henry Holt & Co.

Christian influence as a steppingstone. The prisoner who can accomplish this is a rare exception. Few are able to win the inner battle of resentment against all the factors that led up to their offense, arrest, trial, and conviction.

No man can be rehabilitated by other people. When a major job of overhauling one's life is indicated—and most law violators stand in need of this—the first person singular is the key. A change of direction can be made in a moment, but the road ahead is still a long one. Penitentiaries and reformatories which house violators for extended periods have built programs of retraining and personal improvement with this in mind. Many long-term institutions have only made gestures in this direction. Jails have used the short-time element as an excuse for doing little or nothing toward rehabilitation. Granted that a more thorough job of personal redirection is possible during a longer period of time, it must be remembered that incarceration is not the only situation within which the job can be done. No one has expressed more forcefully than Oscar Wilde the need for a qualitative rather than a quantitative perspective:

The vilest deeds like poison weeds
Bloom well in prison-air;
It is only what is good in Man
That wastes and withers there:
Pale anguish keeps the heavy gate,
And the Warder is despair.

Each narrow cell in which we dwell
Is a foul and dark latrine.
And the fetid breath of living Death
Chokes up each grated screen,
And all but Lust is turned to dust
In Humanity's machine.²

No literature, however, can equal a visit to a penitentiary. The typical cell may house as many as eight men. In modern prisons the cell is literally a latrine. Backward prisons are worse, using buckets in lieu of plumbing. Aside from this they may be clean, and the inmates' thoughts are not constantly preoccupied with conveniences or lack of them. There is much else to think about.

Consider the men in an average penitentiary cell. John Doe is serving ten years for counterfeiting. Joe Rich has three years

² *Ibid.*

³ Federal offenses are listed because of the writer's familiarity with federal prisons.

for embezzlement. George Still is doing eighteen months for making liquor. Bill Fast drove a stolen car across a state line; sentence—four years. Charlie Stamp has five years for mail fraud. Harry Hold is in for twenty years for conspiring to kidnap. Leonard Light carried out a kidnaping but was given only six years—different case and different court from Hold's. Dick Roe has fifteen years for an impulsive act while in military service. With each prisoner goes his pedigree in terms of crime and length of sentence, for these are the barest facts which account for his presence in the prison. This kind of pedigree tells little about the person himself; yet personal factors are the most significant ones for rehabilitation.

The ages of the men in the sample cell range from the late twenties to the late sixties. Educational backgrounds include fourth-grade level to college graduation. Marital status extends from single in all directions through common-law, monogamy, multiple divorce, and widowed. Early home backgrounds show as much variation, involving orphanhood, over-privileged status, etc. Previous records range from "nothing" to "habitual." Intelligence level, religious history, health, reading interests, and all other known criteria are just as disparate. The sentences are in all stages of completion.

The conscientious prison workers' first impulse is to try to bring order into the group picture. "Classification" is the magic word for the diagnosis of prisoners. Then comes careful segregation, so that treatment may be in accordance with needs. This is not easy. One may picture himself trying to classify and segregate. Experience shows that a smooth-running institution can be maintained if prisoners are classified according to their attitude of co-operation with the work and discipline program of the prison. But this does not reach the level of the prisoner's inner desire to improve, since prison-wise repeaters can be very co-operative while planning their next escapade after release.

Could segregation be based on the type of crime? A law can be violated intentionally or inadvertently, on impulse or by long deliberation, by old or young people. How about segregating by length of sentence—so that there could be a kind of academic progression with a "graduation"? Here again personal factors are lost; courts do not give the same length of sentences according to personalities nor even in the same type of offense. It is commonplace to see men serving sentences in direct proportion to the legal agility of their defense lawyers.

For religious purposes the chaplain might like to influence the pro-

gram of segregation. While attempting this he may encounter two men named—for convenience—Dexter and Hard. Dexter knows church work. He was a church treasurer before he was caught evading taxes. His personal attitudes for years were those of the scribes and Pharisees. On the other hand, Hard never darkened a church door. He ran a large racket, but was generous with charities which were unrelated to his criminal organization. Which man is the better prospect for religious training? What were the criteria of Jesus in the selection of persons to whom he gave special attention? "Jail-house religion" is notorious for its converts who can fulfill at the moment every formal requirement for conversion. The regimented life of prison is a lopsided testing ground for "fruits worthy of repentance."

After attempting to make a sensible grouping out of the human materials of the prison, one discovers that there is a limit to what can be accomplished by present methods and wisdom. Opportunities can be given to groups, but there is always a wide heterogeneity within each group. The kind of appeal which reaches such a variety must be very general indeed. Realizing this, prison work has come to its best efforts in individualized treatment. Perhaps the word "hopes" should be substituted for "efforts." Any kind of individualized program takes more in money and personnel and equipment than the public has begun to think about.

II

The brief jumble of facts in these pages should be enough to show that the terms "criminology" and "penology" do not deal with a specific area. People in prison reveal a tangled mass of most of the unsolved human problems one can contemplate. Penology is not a single science but a focus of many sciences and opinions upon a kind of six-way traffic intersection of tragic failures. No one is so painfully aware of the personal and social imperfections of this scene as is the prisoner. How simple it would be to reclaim the lives of the convicted if all were penitent, recognizing their faults, and able to restore the bonds of trust between themselves and society! But the obvious facts before them and within them are many-sided.

The philosophy of prisoners is often expressed like this: "The main difference between us and people 'outside' is the difference between the caught and the uncaught. Everyone breaks laws. True, some do it ignorantly, or their violations are minor, but the fact remains that no one is innocent. Many are deliberately guilty and get by with it. We who are

serving time are the suckers who bungled a job, the small operators who take the rap for the bosses, and the otherwise unlucky ones. Some of us didn't steal enough, for the man who steals a million dollars usually hires legal help which enables him to get off light. Furthermore, we insist on a distinction between the breaking of some of the antiquated or technical laws as contrasted with the committing of a sin. There are a lot of sins which do not get people into prison; there are violations of human rights which can stay within the law; and there are crimes which do not involve moral turpitude. In view of all this, we sometimes think we are actually being punished for our clumsiness, according to rigid legal usage, rather than for the real wrong we have done. This feeling does not justify or excuse us, but it makes us think that our punishment is exorbitant as compared with the uncaught or the legally safe sinners. We conclude that human justice is truly blind."

This philosophy has flaws; but it may be used to help the prisoner seek a higher justice within his own future relationships. Moreover, the prisoner is trying to tell the general public not to regard him as a particularly vile sinner on the sole grounds of his incarceration. Citizens should re-examine their attitudes toward prisoners. Christians need to re-examine our whole legal system in the light of its effects upon human beings. No matter how humane a prison becomes, there are basic questions which clamor for better answers. Is the prison primarily a place of punishment or a place of redirection? If the latter, how can the length of sentence come to be related to the constructive changes the prisoner makes? Does anyone really know which types of people can be successfully treated by the methods of incarceration—and how can our system be changed so that the person rather than the crime becomes the focus of effort? Does the threat of punishment really deter people from breaking laws? (If so, how can it be proven, or—more important—how can we deal better with those who are not deterred, who populate the prisons when caught?) By what logic is a sharp financial deal righted by sending a man to a tax-supported institution while his family also becomes a public charge? Can violators be given more encouragement and opportunity to make actual restitution *in kind* for certain crimes? Why should a man forfeit a few years of freedom for a deed which caused an entirely different kind of loss to other people?

Questions of this kind are frequently in the minds not only of prisoners but of conscientious prison workers as well. Among the representatives of the several vocations of the personnel of a prison, the chaplain has

a uni
with
chara
comp
many
spons
respo
not a
of an

spons
Too
work
churc
nomin
Fifte
was a
churc
Coun
to est
been
a den
who a
inmat
churc
forget
these

but al
The p
person
field
specia
tically
among
stood
patic

A

a unique role. He is the only one whose life is so intimately linked up with a community agency, the church, which has a paramount interest in character-building. At times he feels that his prison congregation is mainly composed of the failures of the church—many who were not reached, or many who were not given examples along with precepts. What is the responsibility of the church to these individuals? What is the church's responsibility toward the improving of legal and penal systems which do not achieve their intended purposes, or do not pretend to deal in terms of any values except property values?

Toward the individuals in prison the church has assumed some responsibility when it has endorsed a clergyman into the prison chaplaincy. Too often this is as far as the matter has been carried. Chaplains have worked at their tasks for one, two, or more years without any visit from a church representative. The ties are growing closer, but only a few denominations are really oriented to the work which their chaplains are doing. Fifteen years ago it was commonly assumed that the institutional chaplain was a problem individual who had lost his usefulness to the "normal" church program. The Department of Pastoral Services of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has done much since that time to establish a high quality of institutional ministry. Nevertheless it has been only a year since a chaplain in one institution received a letter from a denominational executive saying, "It is hard to keep up with you men who are on *detached* service." (*Italics mine.*) Does this imply that the inmates of a prison are in some way detached from the concern of the church? Of course not, but church people need an awakening to their forgetful attitudes toward the prisoner and a thorough Christianizing of these attitudes.

III

The crux of the matter is found not only in the individual prisoner but also in the principal factors which have helped make him what he is. The past two decades have seen rare progress in the scientific study of personality growth and character-formation. Many of the findings in this field are becoming common knowledge, but those which pertain to the special personality problems of law violators remain little known and practically unused. Actually, the commonest type of problem personality among prisoners—if it can even be called a type—is not very well understood by anyone. This has been variously called "constitutional psychopathic inferiority," "psychopathic personality," or "character disorder."

A few excellent books have appeared in recent years with masterful

descriptions of the puzzling and miserable people who fall into this classification. But that is as far as has been reached—description. There are a lot of experts who can tell of the escapades of these individuals; there are also some experts who can give an accurate picture of the inward wretchedness which drives such persons into destructive behavior. Very few are the workers in any profession who can claim that they have achieved any measurable, lasting results in rehabilitating a sufferer from this disorder. There is no maladjustment which is more costly to all of us in money, time, and misery. And no one understands it. Worse, practically nothing is being done to find out what causes the real trouble. Public agencies spend hundreds of millions of dollars to apprehend, try, convict, house, feed, and guard those who have character disorders. Virtually nothing is spent to investigate their maladjusted condition or to try new methods of treatment which are already indicated by the meager existing knowledge. Does the church have a responsibility in the realm of character problems? If so, what can be the relation of the church to the best-known methods of study now available?

In brief, the realm of personal difficulties found in the prison may be visualized in a descending tour, like that of Dante, until the nadir is reached: the fundamental problem of individuals whose character is lacking in some essential way from its very beginning. There is no more baffling experience than the attempt to help such a one. It is a common occurrence for an enlightened judge to decide that John Doe, for example, is ill and in need of treatment rather than imprisonment. He places John on probation with the stipulation that he be admitted to a psychiatric hospital for study and therapy. Psychiatrists complete their examinations and conclude that there is a disorder, but it is of this kind which does not respond to available methods of treatment. Eventually John is returned to the court for legal disposition and the judge must decide for the welfare of society, giving up his direct effort to help the individual.

Some authorities would disagree with my opinion that the psychopathic personality is the major unsolved problem of the prison population. There are diagnosticians who narrow the concept of this disorder to a special few, while others broaden it to include a majority group of inmates. In either approach it can be said that substantial progress in working concepts is necessary to make possible better differentiation and treatment of this and related problems. Such progress is the primary concern of technical specialists in psychopathology. The church, by and large, is scarcely aware of what its relationship ought to be to this area of endeavor. As a

chaplain I felt a moral obligation mixed with a sense of futility in dealing with psychopaths. Other workers, penologists, psychiatrists, social workers, and psychologists have expressed similar feelings. The vagueness of the role of the church is a commentary on the lack of integration between the forces of religion and other agencies working for human welfare in our society.

Historically, the Christian faith has been more concerned with *answers* to problems than with *explanations*. The relevance of Christian teaching to psychopathic personalities is at once apparent, however, if we examine some of the theories about the origin of the problem. Leaders in the dynamic approach to the study of personality are agreed that character difficulties either originate or are accentuated by disturbances in the love relationships between the mother and the infant in very early life. When trouble has begun, there is still considerable possibility of change for the better by child guidance (and especially parental guidance) methods already known. The church needs to assume great responsibilities for prevention and early modification of problem situations within its reach, among families.

How to apply the best of theories to the adult psychopath is still a trying question. But the most heroic affirmation of faith is one made in the face of inadequate knowledge or guarantees. I wish it were possible to say that all we need do is present the Gospel to these people and they will become converted and healed. Actually, they are usually unable to grasp any teachings in quite the same spirit and behavior-meanings in which they are given. At the same time it is puzzling but gratifying that a remarkable few, unpredictably and amid many pressures along with Christian teaching and example, undergo lasting changes. Some penologists call this a process of late maturing. It occurs sometimes among "habitual" offenders who have reached a rock bottom of hopelessness and make it a turning point. The chaplain who is present and able to give guidance at such a time enjoys a rare privilege and yearns for it to happen to many more inmates in his parish. I marvel to recall the story of Joe. I met him early in my prison work. By record and reputation he was lacking in personal assets. In two prisons where I knew him he demonstrated adeptness at most of the personal practices which are disturbing to prison administrations and populations alike. He was labeled as one with a character disorder of the more dangerous and discouraging type. We had two formal interviews. He was brief and to the point: "Chaplain, you are wasting your time and mine."

Difficulties arose and he was placed in solitary. After three weeks he sent for me and requested that I carry a message to another inmate, a message which would only make matters worse. I refused, explaining that I was not interested in promoting his maneuvers but I was deeply interested in him as a person who could find a better way of living. This brought a characteristic rebuff, and after a few more weeks the trouble blew over and he returned to his former status. Months later he was involved in a near-fatal accident. He sent for me again. At the prison hospital I learned that his recovery was very doubtful. He sensed this but said that he was going to get well, regardless, and that he was going to seek God's help to live a Christian life to the best of his ability. Under the circumstances he could have been somewhat delirious. Moreover, he had brushed close to death several times before in his colorful career, and there was no reason to expect a different outcome if he should recover this time. He was aware of these questions, too, and went on to say that this was the first time he had made a promise to God. "I am not asking anyone to believe what I say. I mean to prove it by what I do, after I get well." And he did. He was given every encouragement by the chaplains, but the victory was his own. His dealings with personnel, inmates, and his relatives were different in every respect from that time on, through three continuing years of incarceration and one year that I was able to follow his progress after release. Every chaplain could duplicate this story among his unusual pastoral experiences and wish that he could precipitate such changes without having to wait for accidents.

Christianity has answers which cure people of disorders that are not yet understood. Even so, prison chaplains would like to have a growing body of clearer understanding and techniques. There is a well-worn proverb about people with character disorders: "One-third of them are in prison; one-third are in mental hospitals; and one-third are in the community making trouble." The magnitude and intricacy of this problem can scarcely be overstated. There is no excuse for ignoring the problem. Long and careful investigation should produce better practical approaches than our present wailing-wall technique. If this paper has any special plea it is for a focus of attention upon the central human problems represented in the character disorders. As we learn how to instill the love of God more powerfully in the hearts of people, we shall not have to worry so much about the complexities of legal systems. We will begin doing this better when we have a better understanding of the human materials with which we are working.

Penal institutions, among other public agencies, are a kind of discard from the testing-grounds of our culture. There is no richer source of information as to what ails our common life. If you want to know what is wrong with the character-producing functions of society, study the human products which have become warped or broken or out of balance. Watch some of them, either from their own efforts or from good handling, recover. Not only will the ways of man be more clearly revealed, but there will be a new vision of the ways of God now at work creating and re-creating those he would bless with his own image.

Was Goethe a Christian?

MIMS THORNBURGH WORKMAN

THE GOETHE BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION at Aspen, Colorado, in June and July of last year centered the attention of our world upon a figure who is one of the most powerfully creative and yet one of the most enigmatical of all human history. From that event is emerging a revived interest in him and in all his writings. A veritable flood of books attempting to interpret his teaching, his personality, and his permanent significance is now issuing from prominent publishing houses. The necessity of understanding and evaluating him has become in a new way vital, felt, and widespread.

If any one of the new books about him were to be singled out and commended to those who would keep abreast of what may be called the Goethe renaissance, I think at this writing it would be *Goethe: Four Studies*, by Albert Schweitzer. In this exhilarating little volume,¹ Dr. Charles R. Joy has collected in his own translation four tributes paid to Goethe by Schweitzer, introducing them with a foreword entitled "Goethe and Schweitzer: Parallel Lives."

In these interpretations of one very great man by another, Schweitzer recurs again and again to the fact that he owes to Goethe some of the major inspirations which go far to account for his own career of redemptive ministry to one of the most backward groups of people on the face of the earth. In particular, he attributes to him the reality of that feeling which he has called "reverence for life." The other and earlier great German has recorded his own domination by that same emotion and principle, and in terms of the very same phrase. The focal passage, as all students of Goethe know, is to be found in those beautiful pages in *Wilhelm Meister* where the traveler comes upon the children who have been disciplined in a forest school to revere what is above them and what is around them, but most of all what is beneath them.

One is compelled, therefore, if by no other consideration, to seek in

¹ Boston: Beacon Press, 1949.

MIMS THORNBURGH WORKMAN, M.A., B.D., is Minister of the Methodist church, Oak Grove, Missouri, and writer for various church and other publications. He prepared the present study in reply to a fellow-pastor's wife who asked him recently of Goethe, "But was he a Christian?"

Goethe what it was that made him the invisible comrade, upholder, and emulatable hero of the man who has been called not only the greatest Christian of our own time, but also the man who most resembles his exemplar, Goethe.

Or if my reader desires to go a little further back among the records of writers and thinkers in the tradition of radiant spiritual idealism, he will be eager to fathom what it was in Thomas Carlyle that made him refer to Goethe as the man who made it possible for him to be a believer in an unbelieving generation. Carlyle was the first writer to introduce Goethe to the British people in a favorable light. He made it for a time his special mission to tell England that she was mistaken in viewing the great German as merely a fountainhead of impropriety, not to say immorality.

The endeavor to bring together into one view, however, and to follow for one's own guidance the life and teaching of the great genius, is attended with special difficulties and hazards. Goethe may not inappropriately be called an enigma to his readers, since it was evident that he was an enigma to himself. And since it is true that only greatness can interpret greatness aright, the seeker after light and leading from Goethe may well gird himself in the armor of humility at the very outset.

To be specific now. Here we have Schweitzer holding in reverence the man from whom he best learned reverence for life. And yet his great teacher refused to call himself a Christian. Hence the title to this present study.

I

Was Goethe a Christian? He himself says he was not. For that disclaimer he gave two reasons. First, he was unwilling to accept all the miracles of the Bible as historical, and his skepticism invaded the area of Christ's own career as memorialized in the New Testament. In the second place, Goethe welcomed truth from all other religions and philosophers, and on a par with the power and the actual guidance he confessedly derived from his cherished Bible. For Luther's translation of the Bible was his daily companion. Many of the dominant concepts in his writings were drawn from it. Goethe held in special esteem the pastors whom he knew, or many of them. He had a deep interest in young ministers, and he delighted to aid them in practical ways. Parsonages were among the homes where he loved most to visit. And it was a pastor's daughter whose name comes down to us in his own handwriting as one of the young women whom he most admired for the simple yet basic excellence he discerned in her. I speak of Frederika Brion, and at the close of my essay I shall

quote something Goethe said about what her home meant to him, even after this one-time sweetheart had married.

Goethe was an aristocrat who more, the longer he lived, enjoyed being with people of the kind who have always been regarded by cultured types as "common." He was a man of many love affairs, admiring young women even when he was quite old, and feeling with all the force of his intense and chaotic nature that each of his romances was an extremely serious affair, and even a determinative influence upon his whole life. For a long time he entertained solemn doubts about the desirability of marriage, and ended by taking as his wife Christiane Vulpius, who had already been living with him, and who had in common with him no intellectual life at all, but only their romantic attachment.

It cannot be contradicted that the man who became Schweitzer's ideal in our own time was a grievous offender against the canons of elemental and Christian morality.

But enough about the difficulty of our subject and our quest, except for one further warning.

In one of his conversations with Eckermann, Goethe expressed his disapproval of anyone's endeavoring to find in his major work, *Faust*, a single summarizing principle of life. He characterized the drama as "incommensurable." The same adjective fits the facts of Goethe's life. What one sees in Goethe will reflect what he is in his own being. That truth explains why he and Napoleon held each other in such high esteem. The situation for the Goethe researcher is further complicated by this one additional fact, namely, that from first to last Goethe did his own thinking, following no accepted idea except for the intrinsic validity he discovered in it. To him, as to all innovators and creators, his individualism brought obloquy, misunderstanding, misinterpretation, and these to his delicately responsive poetic nature gave that strain of melancholy which at times amounted to despondency.

We know that he never would have completed *Faust* but for Schiller's persistent encouragement. I do not believe the reason lay in any degree of lethargy Goethe may ever have felt, for it was to him a basic belief that continuous activity on the level of one's highest creative plateau not only was necessary to one's becoming a complete personality, but also he taught that when a man has put out all he has in him, he has the right to expect of the universe an eternity after his death wherein he may vindicate, by continuing them, the incessant labors of his life on earth. This idea has figured in Christian preaching. No great soul of the past inculcates it more passionately than does Goethe.

No smooth life, dead at heart, facilely describable within the categories of Lutheran pietism, could ever have created such a being as Goethe's Mephistopheles. Owing indeed something to the Satan in the biblical drama of Job, he nevertheless steps coolly out of the conventional habiliments wherein the devil has appeared on many a church window and in the pictures adorning the family Bibles, to become a very personable and engaging sort of man. Goethe was too profound and too clear an observer of life to make his devil *prima facie* repulsive. And before we can go further we must raise the question to what degree Goethe drew from his own inner struggle with sin his most plausible and yet his most sinister character, Mephistopheles, of whom Emerson wrote that he was "the first organic figure to be added to literature for some ages."

It remains now to examine *Faust* from the standpoint of its being a work of profound moral earnestness, manifesting, that is to say, the quality of *serious* evaluation of human experience from a spiritual standpoint which Carlyle felt the German people had in greater measure than the brilliant but superficial French and the practical but money-minded English and American.

It is not necessary for me to remind my reader that the two parts of *Faust* represent a labor extending over sixty years; that again and again its author revised, shelved, drew out again and emended what amounts to the essence of his autobiography. Why did he desire the whole work not to be publicized until after he was dead? Can it be that he felt himself unable to undergo the emotional tax of seeing enacted on the stage the passages which were written out of his own struggle for redemption quite as much as they were mediated through the vehicle of a familiar tale of the supernatural, the legend of Dr. Faustus?

From here forward, my reader must form his own answer to the question which Emerson raised and answered in the negative, but to which Carlyle and Schweitzer reply, "yes." My final suggestion is that the answer to the question whether Goethe was a Christian involves an understanding of *what Christianity is* in its essence, as much as it demands a better acquaintance with the actual Goethe.

II

The greatest of all German dramas, and to some minds the profoundest literary product of the modern age, *Faust*, is the autobiography of a multiplex personality, a man who emerged from inner confusion to that peace of soul which is the highest evidence of God's presence, by renouncing the claim of intellect (in its connotation of mere cleverness) to

be his guiding light. A man who had been many personalities became one. From a confusion of tongues within himself he achieved harmony and synthesis. After a career of dalliance with temptation, he learned to say no with all the force of his being to that interpretation of culture which makes it consist in esthetics devoid of moral import.

The successive revisions, I say, of *Faust*, and the insertion of the second part, the *Helena*, reflect the writer's own upward-winding spiritual progress. In this fact we find the clue which may be followed through those mazes (amounting to pages and pages) for which so many interpretations have been offered by commentators, none of them approving itself to us as having finality.

Viewing it as a whole under the valid assumption that here Goethe confesses himself a sinner seeking salvation, we may accurately term *Faust* a drama of redemption.

Part One opens with youth's powerful, piteous outcry of hunger for sense-life in its fullness, panting for an uninterrupted and an undiminished experience of "the rush of joy that felt almost like pain." It closes with the song of an angel choir on Easter Day announcing that heaven has granted atonement for the errors committed by flesh and intellect. The recent dupes of evil are now eligible for Paradise. Evil, having been renounced, becomes actually a steppingstone toward the perfect vision and experience of goodness.

Goethe had been in his early years a tumult-ridden man. Fightings without and fears within were his. Moreover, he lived in a time when his nation was coming to the end of an era. He saw projected upon the screen of political life crisis, change, and overthrow, as clearly as he saw the drama that goes on throughout a man's conscious life within his own soul. Following his principle that the essence of being a poet is to be able to universalize the particular, he framed in *Faust* a motion-picture of man and society as these were known to him.

Furthermore, he knew so many things and so many people that he, who was accurately called later "the last universal man," was himself each of the *personae* in his sublime drama.

I mean to say that everything Goethe ever wrote was autobiographical in the sense that he so completely identified himself with his characters as to make them bespeak what he himself was, and what he thought and felt, quite as truly as they succeeded in voicing wordlessly for him his indebtedness to the ancient Greek and to the medieval European mythology wherefrom he drew much of his fabric.

By a miracle of self-transference he identified himself with the mind and the moods of his Mephistopheles. Not only did he strip the devil of his conventional hoofs and horns, and put him into German breeches and hose. He made him the supreme embodiment of the Spirit of Denial. Cynicism, in the person of this being whom Goethe has created, becomes once and for all horrible. Mephistopheles knows everything and believes nothing. He is clever beyond reckoning. He has a manner with women, even the most innocent like Gretchen, which is irresistible. He wins this girl to his will by appealing to what is deep in everyone, whether man or woman—her sense of beauty, symbolized by her delighted surprise at finding the jewels he has left in her room.

This devil stands as a complete stranger to anything and everything that is of the nature of reverence for God or regard for man or concern for any creature God has let live on this earth. We may get a freshened sense of Goethe's feeling of abhorrence for anything irreverent by comparing his portraiture of Mephistopheles with that passage from *Wilhelm Meister* to which I have already alluded, where reverence in its threefold direction is found in well-schooled children, and with the wild forest for its appropriate locale.

This Spirit of evil, of denial, of irreverence, is able to whisper sinful enticements with pleasing effects into a maiden's ear, and into a grown man's as well. He possesses absolute self-assurance. His entrance into Faust's life has been prepared for by that earnest and high-minded man's passion to achieve all attainable human experience, to miss nothing that life holds, to find and to keep what he has sought for to no avail between the covers of books and by the aid of laboratory apparatus. He *knows* what Faust needs! He will impart a bit of his omniscience to this man who manifests his folly by devoting himself to the obviously unrewarding career of a scholar.

Goethe is of course Faust himself, and Faust is Goethe. The author has passed through the epoch of inner life in which we find Faust at the opening of Part One. Goethe's own career was an unending and a devoted quest for knowledge. But he found for himself that academic pursuits do not satisfy the soul. That was a time of cold scholasticism, which Goethe has caricatured now and again in the drama. He himself has sat under professors of the kind Carlyle characterized at about that same time as spectacles behind which there are no eyes.

Gretchen can be won to Mephistopheles' designs because she, too, is governed by a great hunger. Like Faust and every other person, she

longs to love and to be loved in love's highest meaning and with love's full power. Mephistopheles succeeds in persuading them both to believe, and to act upon the belief, that the voice of sensual desire is the highest the human ear can ever hear, representing as it does the only existent reality in life, so that one must obey, at once and whenever it comes, the lure of the flesh. Their acceptance of Mephistopheles' idea works in them all those aspects of doom which are so clearly depicted by Goethe because he saw them so clearly within himself and within his world.

Our own age is warned by Faust's initial plight. He is a student without any spiritual moorings. Driven by his feeling of need for self-improvement, he understands no necessity but to drive himself in unceasing research into all the fields he can find of undisclosed knowledge. He slaves at his books. But they have shown him no reason for living. They hold before his burning over-used eyes no cooling picture of a haven where rest and peace are.

Into such well-prepared soil the Spirit of Negation drops the evil suggestion that since happiness is for a human being the basic necessity, and since there is no reason nor any meaning in anything at all, the only thing you can do in accordance with your own nature is to take your fun where you find it, and lose no time getting started. How current to ourselves this sounds!

Hence the bargain that Mephistopheles proposes and Faust agrees to. He sells his soul to the devil in return for a promise of happiness. The consequence to Faust and to Gretchen is no other than what it has always been, in all true literature and in life. Shakespeare and the Hebrew-Christian Scriptures repeat it from the first page to the last. The man and the girl are doomed and without hope. Mephistopheles delights to din into their ears that this is their condition. Gretchen goes mad and murders her child. But in heaven the angel choir sings to her at Easter that she is redeemed.

This eternal war between sin—which, inconceivably sinister and ill-working, disappoints and outrages its initial bright promises—and over against it the spirit of man in his yearning for he knows not what, is the heart of what Goethe wrote for mankind in the first part of *Faust*. How late—too late for him to realize any return from his awakening—did Faust find out that what he had cried out for was God, and what God alone could give, namely, a happiness based upon chastity!

Much more confusing, and certainly described even more aptly by its author's adjective "incommensurable," is the second part of *Faust*, to

which he gave the title, *Helena: a Classico-romantic Phantasmagoria*. But we need not assume that "incommensurable" means here the same thing as "incomprehensible."

In the *Helena* the stage is more spacious and has more *personae* on it. Among these are many beings who are the subjects of Greek mythology. Goethe also created mythical characters of his own. Then, too, the dramatic movement proceeds behind a cloud of allegorical connotation. But Goethe is opaque in places because human experience is. I have suggested already that genius never presents unclear things as if they were transparent. Great writers do not tone down the fact that many and long stretches of life's pilgrimage are a faring forward through thick shadows.

Helen, who is history's supreme pattern of feminine beauty, but who was attended by many woes, hazards, disappointments, and injuries, was as much Goethe himself as she was Greece's ideal. She was all the things he had done to hurt himself, and she was all the things that other people had done to him that were hard to bear. She had known them all. Every one of them had befallen her.

So Goethe created his Helen from within himself as much as he inherited her from an ancient time and place. Greek literature and art, living again in the European Renaissance, placed in his hands not a finished cloth but a skein of bright threads which he wove together, adding many of his own, entirely new, to make this glorious garment for his own aspirations, the *Helena* which is the second part of the drama *Faust*.

He created his Helen out of everything the old Greeks were and lived and wrote, everything that challenges our modern horridness and sinfulness. We see standing before us in her sorrowing loveliness this woman who, more than any other in all history or myth (yet somewhat in the manner of Milton's Eve in *Paradise Lost*), symbolizes that supreme degree of beauty and its most captivating form, the personality and the ideal aspect of Woman, her in whom everyone in the whole world does or ought to find his joy, and in whom also the human race has its unity.

The Eternal-Womanly
Draws us above.

So closes *Faust* with the song of the mystic* choir chanting woman's right to be man's agent of redemption—as in the conclusion of the more individualistically slanted first part of the drama, a similar celestial chorus attributes to heaven and all its powers the hope whereupon man depends to be saved from his sins. Both are true. Woman, who in the first part

is the occasion of man's undoing, becomes afterward the beautiful hand which he grasps, to be lifted by it to the attainment of his spiritual desires.

We may be able in a moment to see better what Carlyle meant when he wrote that Goethe, in his life and especially in *Faust*, united "the belief of a saint" with "the clearness of a skeptic!" But at the present point we can grasp that Goethe, *via* the person of his Helen, is teaching the same thing that Sir Robert Bridges is urging upon the twentieth century in the profoundest philosophical poem of our time, *The Testament of Beauty*. Is it not this: that everything which exists and everything that anyone can experience, if it be desirable and of undying effect, may be gathered up within the concept and fact of beauty? But also that beauty is a *moral* reality, a holy object of adoration for man. She is his Queen, and she will never command him to do anything but what is good and true and right.

Thomas Carlyle could perceive how well Goethe knew that beauty is infinitely more than a dilettante's whimsy, and that esthetics are inalienable from ethics. Ralph Waldo Emerson could not see this, and for that reason his evaluation of Goethe as not being a Christian is unjust and untrue.

When Goethe's Helen looks herself in the face she sees a puzzle. *Why* has she suffered so many things at so many hands, and for so many years? Why has burden added itself to burden? Why have peril and disenchantment formed with countless companions of their own kind a life story which can be summed up as a rain of burning tears?

Mephistopheles, masking himself as the crone Phorcyas, seeks to console the Queen of Beauty by recalling to her how she, more than any other woman in the whole world, has known "the unexhausted joys of love." But the conqueror of men and the creator of wars is herself fate's victim, and she replies,

Remind me not of joys: on all-too heavy woes
 Infinitude soon followed, crushing breast and heart.

This is Carlyle's translation of those lines. In his essay on the *Helena* he cites long passages of his own rendering.

Carlyle makes plain that this second part of *Faust* teaches how redemption awaits the social order through mankind's experiencing anew the fact, the meaning, and the beneficent force of woman at her best; and by the recovery, in whatever contemporary dress, of what Goethe felt to be the essence of Helen's importance for all time, namely, that woman's loveliness suggests something higher, divine, redemptive.

Goethe saw this socially or collectively saving process taking the form of Northern Europe's recovery and reincarnation of the ancient Grecian feeling for beauty. Faust and Helen mate to become the parents of Byron, in whom Goethe sees antique classicism and its revival finding its best expression.

Man when redeemed becomes redemptive. Hence Faust's project in his old age: to reclaim a large tract of land from the ocean and to provide more room for a free people to live in, in freedom's essential meaning of having ground to cultivate and room for the spirit to love and enjoy life. But Faust's pragmatism, and Goethe's, we may safely assume to be not the motive but the consequence. Woman is at the heart of things. She evinces divinity. She is in that sense man's highest motivating force.

Therefore if the age which was modern to Goethe, and if our own day and generation, can feel beauty as the Greeks felt it, and if we can voice our feeling for it in literature and song as did those geniuses of the olden time, then mankind can reach its highest conceivable goal of endeavor, and gain our reward in the golden coin of a happiness beyond belief.

How to find continuity between the first and the second parts of *Faust* is the despair of all commentators. But at least we may say that amid the social complex represented by the chaotically crowded stage of the *Helena*, Goethe finds for mankind as a whole that same happiness, Helen and her beauty being the source of it, which Mephistopheles so suavely but deceptively represented to Faust and to Gretchen as a gift from the fleshly part of one person to the fleshly part of another.

The first part of *Faust* is romantic in spirit. It has for its base one person's, Gretchen's—and involved with hers, but not so clearly stated, Faust's—deliverance from sin. The *Helena* is more characteristically intellectual in its mood and its appeal, and it is shaped around the social aspect and scope of salvation.

So we may say that one may unlock the complete *Faust* by using two keys. One is the distinction between individual and social redemption. The other is the unity between these two. The unity is deeper than the difference. The two salvations are separable only in their numerical aspect. Society is many, man is one; but salvation for the mass and for the individual are the same in meaning and in modus.

What, then, is it to be saved? It is to commit oneself and to experience the fact that life is not principally intellect, but resignation in an active and co-operative sense to a supreme and compelling Ideal. It mat-

ters little whether you call it Truth or Beauty or Goodness. Goethe teaches in both parts of *Faust* that these three are all one and the same. Together they endowed Gretchen with the appeal of innocent maidenliness. In a more complex way, less easy to express in writing, we see them in Helen, whose form and face are a sacrament, "the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace," in all she is and does and says.

After such a purview of the drama as we have undertaken here, I do not doubt that my reader will prefer to side with Carlyle in calling Goethe a saint, if the alternative is to withhold from him, as Emerson does, the right to be called a Christian man, on the ground that his estheticism contained no core or shred of morality.

III

From sources other than *Faust*, but in equal degree autobiographical and written by Goethe's own hand, we may conclude this study. Here are certain indexes to Goethe's interests, character, and religious nature which must be taken into account if one may hope to answer the question whether he was a Christian, and at the same time the correlative one, namely, *what is Christianity* in its root meaning?

The quotations are from Biermann's collection, *Goethe's World*, which Mr. James Laughlin, for the publishers, New Directions, New York City, has granted me permission to use here.

The first citation will go some length to explain what it was that caused Goethe to consider *The Vicar of Wakefield* one of his most cherished books. It gave him a picture of wholesome rural family life such as came near to being his own ideal for himself.

On September 28, 1779, he wrote to Frau von Stein from Em-mendingen, after visiting his parents in Frankfort, then going with the Duke to Switzerland, but stopping *en route* to visit two women whom he had felt to be among the major inspirations of his life and writing. He has the following to say about one of them, Fredericka Brion, daughter of the Sesenheim pastor:

On the 25th. I took a bypath leading to Sesenheim, while the others continued on their journey. And there I found the family, which I had left eight years ago, all together and I was warmly and well received. As I now am pure and calm as the air, I welcome the breath of good and quiet people. The daughter of the house had once loved me—more than I deserved and more than others to whom I have given much passion and faithfulness.²

² p. 139.

Those words from the thirty-year-old man do not represent him in the unfavorable light in which Emerson saw him.

In that same year he wrote this to his mother:

I do not dare to overlook the time since October, 1775, during which I have been in the midst of the bustle of the world. May God continue to help me and give me the light so that we should not be so much in our own light. He may make us do the proper things from morning until night and may give us a clear notion of their consequences. That we may not be like those people who complain about headaches the whole day and use remedies against them, but drink too much wine every evening. May the idea of the pure—extending to the very bite I take into my mouth—become more and more lucid within me.³

His abounding compassion for his fellow men, expressed in many places throughout his writings, is revealed in the following letter which he wrote from Weimar on November 2, 1778, to J. F. Kraft, a man in bodily need who had confided his plight to the greatest literary man in Europe and asked for his aid.

Goethe's reply evinces that tender and undissimulated reverence for submerged personalities which Schweitzer has been so quick to emulate, and with so great success.

The most cruel blow to a man struggling against the waves is to see that the most willing hand on land lacks sufficient strength to rescue all whom the storm may drive toward his shores, when he—to whom a human life would be the richest yield of justice—must content himself with a little and behold the others perish.

I do not think I am mistaken in the picture of your personality which I derive from your letters, and what grieves me all the more is my inability of affording either help or hope to a man whose demands are so moderate.

Near this pool, which an angel but seldom stirs, hundreds linger for years; a few only can be healed, and I am not the man who, in the meantime, can exclaim, "Arise, and walk!"

Accept the little I can give you as a plank thrown out to you, for the moment, to gain time.

Remain for the present where you are, and in the future I am willing to arrange for some little assistance. Let me know when you receive the money, and how far you think it will go. Should you want a coat, an overcoat, boots or warm stockings, let me know, for I have some to spare.

Accept these drops of balm from the traveling medicine-chest of the willing Samaritan in the spirit in which they are given.⁴

⁴ p. 131.

³ p. 137.

Evangelizing the Whole of Life

GERALD O. McCULLOH

EVANGELISM DENOTES THE ACT of establishing a living conscious relationship involving two or more persons in giving and receiving the gospel. It is not a name for a thing, a substance, or an impersonal fact. The term will here be used to mean the whole dynamic experience in which the Word of the gospel is spoken to a hearer, the hearer receives it, and enters into mutual understanding and trust with the giver of the Word.

This usage is supported by Jesus' recognition that to those among whom the Word of the gospel fell on deaf ears it was not the good news. The hearts of those who would not hear were hardened. Paul likewise noted that to some the narrative of the act of God in Christ was foolishness and a stumbling block. Only to those who heard and responded was it the power of God unto salvation. To limit evangelism to the idea content of the message or to its proclamation is ill-advised. It is rather the *message* and *meeting* of giver and receiver in conscious communion.

The message was that the God of Power who had acted in the events of history from creation onward, the God of Justice who had spoken through the law and the prophets, was also the God of Redemptive and Forgiving Love. His eternal purpose was to enter into personal fellowship with his children. In order to release them from the bondage in sin which they had chosen, he sent his beloved Son to be their light upon the way, their bread of strength to walk in that way, and their hope of immortality in his gracious presence.

Jesus Christ was therefore the evangel, the bearer in his person of this good news. In Christ there came together the revealing and redemptive functions by which man's deliverance from bondage was to be achieved. In his person and work he was the Lord and Savior of men. The Incarnation was accomplished in the flesh and in time, in order that man might see God's salvation beginning here and now. Though God is not bound within the frame of the actual and phenomenal, yet it is upon man in the world that God's gift of saving grace is bestowed.

GERALD O. McCULLOH, A.M., S.T.B., Ph.D., is Henry Pfeiffer Professor of Systematic Theology at Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois.

These are the given facts, the historical data, upon which our programs of evangelism must be built.

The divine gift is not complete, however, apart from the meeting in which it is received. Man is not merely a response mechanism. He senses, feels, thinks, decides, and sacrifices in pursuit of ideal ends. Men are evangelized only as they enter actively into fellowship and communion with God.

The analysis which follows is divided into four parts, corresponding to the four phases of the whole response which man must make as he receives the gospel. The first deals with the encounter with God through Christ in which faith comes to birth. The last three represent man's response in those areas of his conscious life to which the term "action" is more customarily applied. These are (1) the inner life of devotion, (2) participation in the corporate life of the Kingdom community, and (3) the undertaking of the vocation to saviorhood in the world of men. In each of the four it is the recognition that Jesus Christ is Lord and Savior which distinguishes the experience as Christian.

THE DIVINE-HUMAN ENCOUNTER IN WHICH FAITH IS BORN

The evangelizing of a particular man begins in his knowledge of God. While it is true that the end being sought is to bring man into the knowledge and love of God, yet apart from the awareness of God man cannot enter into faith in him. Pascal's word from God, "Thou wouldst not seek me if thou hadst not already found me," is not a pantheistic fantasy, but sheer fact.

The knowledge of God which is the basis of man's personal encounter with him comes first in general revelation or prevenient grace. This does not mean the esthetic tracery of color pattern on the pheasant's wing, or the tendency of physical bodies to attract each other which is called the law of gravity. Nor is it some conclusion to which one man can lead another by "evidences" from impersonal nature. It is that quality of personal sensitivity and understanding of the things of the spirit upon which the convincing force of the natural evidences depends. Man is spirit. He is capable of apprehending spiritual truth, of owning spiritual obligations. The general revelation of God upon which all evangelizing must build is this spiritual sensitiveness of the subject to whom the appeal is made. The image of God in man is not whole and entire, but neither is it totally destroyed.

In addition to God's gift of a spiritual nature, there is a special divine declaration or act. Man becomes more vividly aware of God as he is struck by the light on his way to a Damascus (Paul), as he walks in the moor and surveys a bloody city that needs his ministry (Fox), as he reads a particular passage from the Scriptures (Augustine), or as he hears the Word in the preaching of a sermon. The importance of this special confrontation is illustrated in the question raised by Mr. Spangenburg, the Moravian pastor, with John Wesley in Georgia. Spangenburg asked, "Do you know that Christ died to save you?" Wesley says he answered, "I know that Christ died to save sinners." The question, thus parried, was thrust again, "Do you know he died to save *you*?" At that time Wesley was uncertain, but after Aldersgate he was sure. The special act of revelation, the moment of personal awareness, had been experienced.

The insistence in the neo-orthodox theological writings upon the uniqueness of Jesus Christ and of the moment when he becomes the Word of God to a particular person is an attempt to emphasize the necessity for the special act of revelation. It seems unfortunate to this writer that the special revelation is held to be so absolutely unrepeatable that any continuity between this event and the general spiritual sensitiveness of the human heart is denied. Historically, special revelation has been set in the context of general revelation.

When God in Christ has been seen in his revealing act, man's initial encounter with God is not yet complete. In this moment man becomes aware of his sinfulness. Having seen the King of purity he cries out the uncleanness of his own heart and lips. The garments of the "old man" suddenly appear to be vulgar and coarse in the light of the righteousness with which man now knows that he ought to be clothed. Here is conviction of sin. Man does not become convicted of sin and then find God. He meets God; then knows himself as sinner.

If this sinfulness is accepted in hardness of heart, selfishness, pride, sloth, or the refusal of God's rightful "claim," then the experience is sure to stop. God does not force his salvation upon anyone. On the other hand, the attitude of the man who hardens not his heart is one of repentance. Herein there is the acknowledgment of inadequacy and inordinancy in genuine remorse. In an upwelling of sorrow and anguish the sinner seeks to cleanse himself through confession by pouring out the sin from his "broken and contrite heart."

and
he
is t
doc
or
just
sati
cen
tion

love
his
to C
dem
mac
pen
In t

This
of t
full
of t
not
of h
fulfi

save
must
pract
expe
searc
"Sea
is th

1
religio

God does not despise the man who comes thus in humble confession and repentance. Even before the prodigal reaches the father's house, he finds the father coming to meet him in gracious outgoing love. This is the experience of forgiveness. Various attempts have been made in doctrinal history to interpret this event in the language of the law court or chivalry's code of honor. The sinner was said to stand before God justified, as if he had not sinned. Christ as God-man gave complete satisfaction for sin's outrage. In whatever language it is described, the central fact is that the separation which was sin is overcome and a relationship of confident, loving trust and communion is established.

Man emerges from this encounter with God in a mutual bond of love and faith. When he has been forgiven, born into the Father's love, his answer is the grateful offering of himself. His faith is his response to God in belief and assurance. The God who reveals, convicts, acts redemptively in love, forgives, and enters into communion is the God made manifest in Jesus Christ. To him man responds in knowledge, repentance, confession, and the enthronement of Christ as Lord of life. In this series of faith-acts the real hearing of the good news begins.

THE CONSECRATION OF THE INNER LIFE

The next step in evangelism is the consecration of the inner life. This is the "internal sacrifice of self" described by Puglisi in his analysis of the life of prayer.¹ Since living is an ongoing and dynamic process, full consecration cannot be achieved in any one moment or single decision of the will. The powers to serve and the opportunities to be met are not static. "New occasions bring new duties." Therefore the experience of hearing and receiving the good news with suitable response can be fulfilled only in lifelong devotion.

Salvation may be best understood in the progressive form of *being saved* (cf. I Cor. 1:18, R.S.V.). Since it concerns a living person it must become a way of life. Such ceaseless salvation is illustrated in the practice of prayer. Prayer is a channel of the grace that flows into the experience of a person. When the devout soul prays there is a heart-searching which seeks to discover if there be any wickedness within. "Search me, O God, and know my way; try me and know my thoughts" is the form of the prelude to continuing confession. This sweeping of

¹ Puglisi, Mario, *Prayer*. The Macmillan Company, 1929. This is a thoroughly scholarly yet warmly religious study of the subject.

one's own dark corners must go on endlessly. The exhortation to "pray without ceasing" is a call to a constant gift of self.

C. C. J. Webb, in his analysis of religious experience, speaks of this soul-searching of the self as the new sense of intimacy which accompanies the awareness of ultimacy in the encounter with God. In the experience of God man not only sees God more clearly, but himself more directly than was previously possible.

The recognition that Christ as Revealer and Redeemer is Lord of the inner life provides the key to the discipline of personal devotion. The man who would walk in the way of salvation becomes aware that the spirit born in his encounter with God must become determinative throughout the whole of himself. Christ, who brought him God's forgiveness, commands his further attention, obedience, and love. A. N. Whitehead's widely quoted statement that "Religion is what a man does with his solitariness" is inadequately descriptive of religion in its entirety. It does, however, call attention to the fact that central to the life of the religious man is the pattern of thoughts and attitudes in which his consciousness consists when he is within the inner closet of his solitude.

Devotional classics as widely separated in personal background, temper, and function as *The Imitation of Christ*, and Francis Greenwood Peabody's *Mornings in a College Chapel*, lay strong emphasis upon the life of private devotion as an indispensable condition of man's going forward in the way of salvation.

Blessed is the soul which heareth the Lord speaking within her, and receiveth from His mouth the word of consolation.

Blessed are the ears that gladly receive the pulses of the Divine whisper and give no heed to the many whisperings of this world.

Blessed indeed are those ears which listen not after the voice which is sounding without, but for the Truth teaching within.

Blessed are the eyes which are shut to outward things, but intent on things within.

Blessed are they that enter far into inward things, and endeavor to prepare themselves, more and more, by daily exercises, for the receiving of heavenly secrets.²

The preservation of an inner privacy for the deeper experiences of life is what proves a soul to be peaceful and strong. Guard your soul's individual life. In the midst of the social world keep a place for the nurture of the isolated life, for the reading and for the thoughts which deal with the interior relations of the single soul to the immanent God.³

Evangelical Christianity has consistently stressed the private as well

² *The Imitation of Christ* (attributed to Thomas à Kempis), III, 1.

³ Peabody, F. G., *Mornings in a College Chapel*, "The Central Solitude," p. 181.

as the public means of grace. Devotional reading, meditation, and prayer are employed as the soul-being-saved achieves the integration of feeling, thought, will, and bodily act.

How far the sanctifying of the heart can go is open to question. There is sharp but genuine difference of opinion among the various theological traditions regarding the possibility of achieving holiness during earthly life. A thoroughgoing treatment of this question is clearly impossible here. But lest the quest for perfection be too summarily dismissed, let it be said that the problems entailed in affirming the possibility of achieving it in this life are no greater than the dangers of comfortable satisfaction with imperfection when the possibility is denied.

Jesus' words, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God," shows the necessity for the entire consecration of the inner life. Salvation goes forward in a growing knowledge of God and the enjoyment of his fellowship. Purity of heart is essential to continuance in the way of salvation.

EVANGELISM AND THE CHURCH

The third phase of evangelism involves man's participation in the life of the church. The church is the body of which Christ, as Evangel, is the head. Christianity is intensely individual. But the Christian is a member of the *ecclesia*, a congregation called into a new social unity in Christ's name. The nurture of the various members occurs as the unity of spirit throughout the body is achieved.

Protestant Christianity has generally looked with disfavor upon any purely sacramental theory of grace. The dictum, "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*" has seemed to exclude the free work of the Holy Spirit. Yet the lesson of history and the experience of every Christian today indicates that the church has been the channel through which the good news has come. To change the figure, the church has been the mother of us all. In her we were born into Christian knowledge; through her we have been nurtured and directed in the way of salvation.

The church is also significantly the community of the faithful. One definition with basis in historic thought sees it as the "community of the chosen." Jesus' words wherein he interprets Pëter's confession points to the propriety of this meaning. The church will be gathered together of those who make the confession of faith in Christ. The kingdom of God is a selective community, and those who do not meet the requirements of faith cannot enter it. T. S. Eliot finds in Christian society today the

closely knit corpus of Christians within the church who are the vital core of its life.⁴ To call attention to this view of the church does not minimize its evangelical function. The urgency to carry the good news to others should be strongest in those who are most faithful.

The welcome of the church whose Lord is Christ will be extended to those who have not had the initial and critical encounter with God. Evangelizing in Christ's name demands that "sinners be called to repentance." If the church is fulfilling its commission there should be those in the congregation who having "come to scoff remain to pray." Techniques employed in reaching the outsiders have varied with each age and circumstance. The cells established by the early Irish missionaries along the waterways into pagan Europe, street and field preaching, tent and tabernacle services, mission schools, home visitation evangelism, personal pastoral counseling, and the teaching of the church school are all extensions of the arms of invitation to faith and fellowship. The Roman Catholic Church regards its hospitals as effective instruments for bringing men and women into its ministry under the urgency of great personal need. In this function the church is serving as the herald, the harbinger of the good news.

The church is further an organization pursuing a program of Christian action. The corporate unity which it represents should seek opportunity to express its group concern in concerted activity. Those who pray and sing together ought to work together. When men and women unite in doing God's will they grow together in his grace.

Insistence must be placed, however, upon the lordship of Christ in the "body of Christians." A community without Christ at its head is not the church. Eating and drinking together may be sacramental or it may be just an orgy, as Paul discovered. Education may be mass reproduction of ideas and skills with Christ left out. Sin can be as much a community enterprise as salvation. An assembly of people once listened appreciatively to Jesus' words upon a mountainside. Afterward they were a mob shouting for his crucifixion. A congregation is the church only when it is united in receiving the good news of God which Christ revealed in saving power.

AN EVANGEL AMONG MEN

The final step in evangelism is taken as man responds to the vocation to saviorhood in the world. This goes deeper than just the adoption of a program of action. It involves the recognition by the regenerate man

⁴ Cf. Eliot, T. S., *The Idea of a Christian Society*. Harcourt Brace & Company, 1949.

that he must be leaven in the lump of life. Man bears the sin of his earthly community as he accepts a priesthood to all men. He not only heralds the Evangel; he becomes an evangel.

Jesus interpreted his commission from the Father to require that he give himself in sacrifice for the sins of his fellow men. He not only brought the good news but identified himself with his message. Slowly through the impact of his life, death, and resurrection some of his contemporaries began to recognize him as Messiah. The lowly Nazarene was Lord and Savior. In him the salvation of God had come to earth. This fact has underlain the long insistence upon his place in the godhead. Here the experience of devotion and Christological theory have agreed. Christ was the Evangel of God.

That *man* is not saved except as he himself becomes savior has not enjoyed the same consistent emphasis. Luther expressed this idea in his doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. However, the more selfish interpretation of that concept has enjoyed a wider acceptance. Protestants have been ready to affirm their rights individually to come into the holy of holies of God. The meaning which Luther attached to the phrase, on the other hand, voices the responsibility which each man who comes to God bears to all other men. The expression "every man a Christ" rings a little strangely at first hearing, but the great reformer's intention cannot be mistaken. He voices his own commitment thus: "And so will I give myself to be, as it were, a Christ to my neighbor, just as Christ has shown himself to me."⁵ And that commission which he binds upon himself he extends to others as he turns to the plural pronoun with these words: "While we believe in him, and are mutually and reciprocally each the other's Christ, doing to our neighbors just as Christ does to us."⁶

The power to save others is not man's own. Nor is man capable of arrogating it to himself after he has received his own salvation. The rôle of savior is always undertaken as an act of God. Nygren calls attention to this responsibility of the saved man, but it is always God's love which is at work in the man who becomes savior to his fellows. The Christian, he says, in whom is God's *agape* is no longer "a mere man, but a god . . . for God himself is in him and does such things as no man or no creature can do."⁷ It is not *man* but the *saved man* who must become a savior.

Man evangelized is man the evangel. As a Christian, "I live, yet

⁵ Luther, Martin, *Weimar Ausgabe*, VII, 66, 3f.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 68, 33f.

⁷ Nygren, A., *Agape and Eros*. The Macmillan Company, 1932, II, iii, 316.

not I; it is Christ that liveth in me." Many times the Christian finds himself pulled up short by the awareness that he has been a stumbling block to another. With equal challenge he can recognize his opportunities in Christ to be cross-bearer for another's salvation. Intercession in prayer rests upon this priestly responsibility for its rationale. Men can and must intercede for one another at the throne of grace. The act of dedication wherein one says, "For their sakes I sanctify myself," is not the special privilege nor burden of the minister. Every Christian finds his experience of salvation reaching its culmination as the charge of Jesus breaks over him, "Take up thy cross and follow me."

The scope of evangelistic responsibility is indicated in the meaning of the term "world" in the Fourth Gospel. The world meant the whole round of the affairs of men, born of the flesh and of the will of man, but not yet born of God. It included money-changers in the temple, rulers of Israel concerned only with the keeping of the law in social respectability, men wanting daily bread more than living bread, and a society more content with its own darkness than with the disturbing disclosures of Christ's light. Into this world Jesus came, not to condemn it, but that through him it might be saved.

The limits of this article will not permit a careful facing of the specific problems which demand cross-bearing action on the part of the Christian. Abuses in national and international political order, race relations, and the economic structure have occasioned sin that will require vicarious sacrifice for redemption. Christians are busy at evangelism throughout the whole sphere of earthly life. One denomination has, for example, a secretary of industrial evangelism. His responsibility is not only to hold services in factories during the noon hour, but to counsel with the representatives of management and labor who determine policies and write contracts. There is a vast difference between just any social action and that which is evangelistic. Mob violence, skull-cracking, lock-outs and layoffs hardly express the Christian spirit. Christian action must undertake to implement the Christian ideal in daily practice. The man who takes up his cross of saviorhood for his fellows cannot be content while men or nations persist in practices which violate Christian love in political, economic, or domestic life.

Evangelism stops short if the news dispatched from headquarters is not received at the farthest outpost. The evangelizing of a life is accomplished only when the hearer of the gospel becomes an evangel in his world.

T
liter
writ
grea
ther
the
with
Apoc
be o
book
mold
main
as E
a ver
its pr
of its

Thes
the V
bound
huma
of an
and t
sleepi
nor d
Hebre
a Hel

Je
ment
here of

The Intimate Journal of an Old-Time Humanist

JOHN PATERSON

THERE IS A TENDENCY today to concentrate on the prophetic literature of the Old Testament almost to the total exclusion of the other writings of the Hebrew people. Not that we desire to derogate from the greatness of the prophets, but it seems worth while to recall to mind that there are other books in the Old Testament. There is a humanism of the Bible represented by such books as Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes within the Canon; and Ecclesiasticus, so undeservedly relegated to the Apocrypha. The vital significance and relevance of these books may not be overlooked. Job stands beside the great classics and is one of the noblest books written. Proverbs has had a continuous and enduring influence in molding character: did not John Ruskin confess that this book was the main factor in the shaping of his life? The very presence of such a book as Ecclesiastes in our Bibles is mute testimony to the fact that it once had a very high degree of popularity: only on this assumption can we explain its presence in the Bible. It is of this strange book and the stranger figure of its author that we now wish to speak.

I

Ecclesiastes occupies a unique position among the Hebrew Sages. These Sages or wise men normally moved within the regular system of the Wisdom Schools; they were regular schoolmen. But Ecclesiastes is bound by no system and is a member of no school. He is a free-lance humanist. J. M. Devine entitles his volume on Ecclesiastes, *Confessions of an Adventurous Soul*. Ecclesiastes is certainly no stranger to adventure, and the book is his intimate journal; it sets forth his inmost thoughts.

Ecclesiastes is not concerned with dogma. He thinks it best to let sleeping dogmas lie. He raises no question as to the existence of God, nor does he deal with the conflict between faith and knowledge. The Hebrew genius was intensely practical, and in that respect Ecclesiastes is a Hebrew of the Hebrews. He is not concerned with the meaning of life.

JOHN PATERSON, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., is Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis at Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey. He treats here of "the final issue of the Hebrew Wisdom movement," the Book of Ecclesiastes.

To him life is more than any theory; and where the Sages saw system and order, Ecclesiastes sees nothing but disorder, arbitrariness, and futility. For him the great questions remain unanswered and the riddle of life is unsolved. He takes his stand upon experience and surveys the world of men: if he is a philosopher, he is profoundly an empiricist.

Bubble of bubbles! All things are a Bubble!
 What is the use of all Man's toil and trouble?
 Year after year the Crop comes up and dies,
 The Earth remains, Mankind is only Stubble. (1:2, 3)¹

Everything Jewish recedes here to the background, and if the book were not written in Hebrew we would not know the author for a Jew. This book is for Everyman: it knows no limitations of color or race.

Ecclesiastes looks at life and looks at it carefully. In fact, it would not be an inexact translation to render the recurring expression, "I turned and I saw," by "I took a second look." It is wise to look twice: something may escape our first glance. He surveys over-all and he notes conflicts of a personal and social nature everywhere.

I in Jerusalem was Israel's King;
 I set my Mind to study everything
 Under the Heavens, how God hath contrived
 That grievous Care men to their work should bring.
 I saw what was accomplished everywhere,
 And all was Bubble and a meal of Air;
 That which comes short cannot be made enough,
 And what grows crooked Man can not make fair. (1:12-15)

Life itself "is bound in shallows and in miseries," for man's will is not free.

Aye, what God wills, that stands for ever fast,
 The Course of things will go on to the last,
 Man cannot add to it or take away;
 God makes the Future as He made the Past.
 His purpose lies beyond our Praise or Blame,
 What has been ever will remain the same;
 Let us then reverence the Unsearchable—
 He will take care to carry out His Aim. (3:14, 15)

God seems far, far away, and the brutality of death hangs like a dark shadow over human life.

¹ The translation (in the meter of Omar Khayyam) is from *Ecclesiastes*, rendered into English verse, by F. C. Burkitt, London, 1922.

For one Event comes both to Man and Beast,
 There's no distinction when the Breath has ceased;
 As one dies, so the other-Bubbles both,
 And man nowise superior in the least.

Who knows the Breath of Man is upward bound,
 While the Beast's Breath sinks downward to the Ground?

Out of the Dust we came, to Dust we go;
 All things return to tread the unchanging Round. (3:19-21)

These words have the sound of clods falling upon coffins. Is there no hope? Not least among the problems of his time are those created by man's inhumanity to man. The wicked seem everywhere to triumph and tyranny maintains its strength. Is God in control of this world?

All things I've seen in these my Days of Bubble;
 Some good men in their Goodness come to trouble,
 Some of the Wicked still prolong their Days
 In Deeds of Wickedness and Dealing double. (7:15)

It's a big Bubble, ah! how often met,
 That Good men suffer what the Bad should get,
 And Bad men get rewarded like the Good,
 Yet seeing such injustice, do not fret; ((8:14)

But things get worse and worse, and the Preacher is forced to stand with Job (9:22) and make his bitter lament:

All's of a Piece; all pay the self-same Price,
 The Man of Virtue and the Man of Vice,
 The Clean and the Unclean, the Devotee
 And he that never brings a Sacrifice. (9:2)

A man of high social standing and complete education, he sees all this and is sorely puzzled. He looks twice at the woes of the world and he finds no help.

I gazed upon the world of Men around;
 From every side welled up the mournful Sound
 Of the Oppressed who weep and have no Friend,
 While their Oppressors thrive upon the ground.

And so I praised the Dead of long ago
 As happier than the Living whom we know,
 And happier he who never has been born
 To see the evil Work done here below.

I noted with what pain Success is won—
 And what's Success, when all is said and done?

Getting the better of another Man—
 Just one more Bubble blown under the Sun. (4:1-5)

Surely it was a sad world into which Ecclesiastes was born! And surely if in this world only we have hope, then are we of all men most miserable. Ecclesiastes saw no way out; he had no keys in his girdle to open the forbidding door that confronted him. Nor could he find a way around that high wall.

But he goes further still. The Sages wrestled with the problem of divine sovereignty and the suffering of the righteous. That is the problem in Job. But Ecclesiastes goes further than the Sages. He will not make his judgment blind. He questions everything and disputes the "goods" of life. Riches, honor, favor, work, and wisdom, not only goods material but goods spiritual, have no value. They lead to nothing. They are just a bubble.

And so I hated Life: it seemed a Curse,
All things under the Sun were so perverse,
All was a Bubble and a meal of Air,
And all my Wisdom had but made it worse. (2:17)

That is surely the black hour of the human spirit: there man stands close to the dark abyss. There is passion in these words, and it is the passion of despair. To his mind virtue finds no reward, spiritual values do not exist, the highest ideals are but illusions:

I told myself, More Wisdom I have gained
Than all that in Jerusalem have reigned;
Wisdom and Folly both proved empty Air,
The more I knew, the more my Mind was pained. (1:16-18)

Peculiarly distressful was the denial of knowledge, for at that time Wisdom seemed to be the key to open every door. Wisdom was power. But here is one who moved through all departments of knowledge and all aspects of human experience, and the result of his study and research left him with the great questions unanswered.

Although I've toiled to gather Knowledge true
To see what Man has done and has to do,
Through Days of study and through sleepless Nights;
To the Great Question I have found no Clue.

For God has ordered His Creation so,
That what it means no one can see below,
However hard one strive to find it out;
The Wisest may Assert, he does not Know.

It n
aste
it is
hid,
no r
us o
Emp
to la
scurr
ment
Is lif
full

doxic
of W
is the

The
sight.
all.
was n

Progr
A
realism
it wer

² M
Classical

All this I have considered, and I see
 The Wise and Good, how little they are free:
 God rules their Action—even Love and Hate
 No man can tell beforehand which shall be. (8:16-9:1)

It may not be possible, as Burke said, to indict a nation, but here Ecclesiastes indicts life itself. The thirst for knowledge is man's endless torment: it is all, says the Preacher, a feast of wind, a meal of air. The secret is hid, and life is vanity, *mataiotēs*, as the Greek version puts it: there is no rhyme or reason in life, only sheer futility. The Preacher here reminds us of Marcus Aurelius:²

Empty love of pageantry, stage-plays, flocks and herds, sham-fights, a bone thrown to lap-dogs, crumbs cast in a fish-pond, painful travail of ants bearing burdens, scurrying of scared little mice, puppets pulled by strings; amid such an environment thou must take thy place gracefully and not snorting defiance.

Is life only a vain show? Is it nothing more than "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing"?

Such is the mood of Ecclesiastes and he gives utterance to it in paradoxical form and often with bitter irony. He will maintain the superiority of Wisdom over Folly, but only to accentuate the painful fact that death is the end of both.

But there's one Law no Wisdom can defy,
 Though I be wise, I like the Fool must die;
 What Gain will then to me my Wisdom bring?
 "This also is a Bubble" was my cry. (2:15, 16)

The whole world seems smitten with a mortal sickness and no cure is in sight. Man is no better than the beasts and a common fate awaits them all. All effort is vain, a striving after wind. The present is bad, the past was not better, and the future will not be otherwise.

Better than Longing is the Presence fair,
 Yet both are Bubbles and a Meal of Air;
 Our Powers and Joys have all been known of old,
 And Men will be exactly what they were. (6:10)

Progress is impossible and ideals are but a will-o'-the-wisp.

All this is not mere pessimism or *Weltschmerz*. It is realism, sordid realism, if you will. Ecclesiastes accepts the universe, but he would that it were better. He values piety, righteousness, and wisdom, and would

² *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*, a revised text and a translation into English by C. R. Raines, Loeb Classical Series, New York, 1930.

fain see them succeed and win reward. But for lack of judgment men grow arrogant and sorely afflict their fellows. He does not long for death; he shudders at its nothingness:

He who yet lives, there still is hope for him,
For living Dogs more than dead Lions grim;
The Living know that they will die at last,
The Dead know nothing, all to them is dim.

Their memory is past, their Race is run,
Their Love, their Hate, their Rivalry is done,
No Part nor Lot have they for ever more
In all the Work of Men under the Sun. (9:4-6)

Neither Buddhist absorption nor Stoic renunciation make any appeal to Ecclesiastes. These are foreign to his thought.

In spite of all his apparent bitterness as a practical man, he has a positive relation to life. He is of the day and not of the night:

Go, eat in Cheerfulness thy daily Food,
And drink thy Wine as an Immortal would.
Be well content, while yet thou canst enjoy,
That God is pleased to let thee still see Good.

Put off thy Mourning, give the rein to Mirth,
Cherish thy Wife while yet thou art on Earth,
While yet the Bubble lasts under the Sun—
This is what God has judged thy Toil is worth.

And whatsoever thine Hand shall find to try,
Do it with all thy Might and Skill—for why?
There's neither Work nor Purpose, Craft or Thought
Or wisdom in the Grave, where thou wilt lie. (9:7-10)

He wills happiness and has no desire for pain; he complains of life, but he does not condemn it. So he comes to the principle, *Carpe Diem*; make the most of things while you may. We see this conflict all through Ecclesiastes, this opposition of moods, this struggle of the head against the heart, the contrast of experience and desire, and the resolve to make of life what one can while one may. For the long night will come when man works no more.

II

What are we to make of all this? His own personal experiences seem to supply the key to his outlook. This intimate journal indicates that he suffered an extreme disappointment and that he was wounded in the house

of his friends (7:28). There may have been a melancholy streak in his nature that disposed him to look on the shadier sides of life. He is the original "gloomy dean." He had hung his harp on the weeping willows and it moaned in the breeze. Moreover it is here that we see the final issue of the whole Wisdom movement. Here we observe the lack of a deep religious feeling that is conscious of the reality of sin and guilt and is not content to impute its own shortcomings to faults in the divine Providence. Ecclesiastes was strangely deficient here: his one-sided supernaturalism, which savors of deism, obscured the sense of personal communion with God. An experience like that of Jeremiah was a sealed book to him. The religious cult and all the heritage of Hebrew piety meant little, almost nothing, to Ecclesiastes. "Our author's only theory of virtue," says T. K. Cheyne,³ "is that no theory is possible." He was too feeble in creative religious power to think out a doctrine of immortality. Job is an eagle soaring in the face of the sun, but Ecclesiastes is a land-blown bird with bedraggled wings and no power of flight. His nature, like that of the Sages, was ethical rather than religious, and in applying the measuring rod of moral order he found the world woefully short.

Furthermore, the intellectualism of that age had a strong influence upon Ecclesiastes. It was an age in which the individual developed at the expense of the community. The first personal pronoun *I* is unduly prominent in this book: he suffers from "*I* trouble," and this ego seems to have few friends. In line with this, he seems to have little of what we call patriotism. As an intellectual aristocrat he feels no call to labor for his fellow men. Because he demands so much for his own ego, he is acutely conscious of the deficiencies of life. It pains him that this noble ego should perish and be forgotten. There is something almost humorous in the words of 2:15: "As it happens to the fool, so it happens also to me, *even me*." To the early Hebrews death did not seem unduly painful, for men were conscious of the group and their connection with it. But the Sage had lost that thought, and "*I*" has taken the place of the group. The Sages no longer hear Rachel weeping for her children. The significant Hebrew thought of *corporate personality* has been lost.

Perhaps that was inevitable in the circumstances of the time. That age with its intellectualism and individualism had no place for the ideal of creative service on behalf of the community. The times were too sorely out of joint and too confused to allow more earnest spirits to discover any

³ Cheyne, T. K., *Job and Solomon*, London, 1887, p. 218.

significant ideal of service. Ecclesiastes had too much of the temperament of Erasmus and too little of the zeal of Luther; he was not the stuff of which reformers are made. He stood at the close of a period and not at the beginning of a new era. The Maccabean revival had not yet come.

But we need not blame Ecclesiastes overmuch. In all this he was the child of his age. And the Greek period was an age in which the community counted for less and less and the individual for more and more. Men claimed the right to live to self and cultivate the ego. Life became the central interest, while the literature of the period assumed the form of *Confessions* or *Meditations*, wherein some bosom friend is addressed. Some scholars have thought of Ecclesiastes as addressing a friend or pupil while others have regarded his book as a record of communings with his own soul. Such forms were customary at that time. Self-education and self-examination became highly popular and the Sage was not slow "to build a cottage in the vale" and retire within himself or the circle of private association. The highest art was self-sufficiency (*autarkeia*), the apathy of the Stoic, the *ataraxia* of the Epicurean and Sceptic.

The old order had passed. The city state was long since gone and the four freedoms were but a memory. Alexander was in the saddle and military colossi bestrode the earth. Nor was it better with the Roman Empire, for it did not leave liberty to the individual. Any creative personality that might emerge was subject to the arbitrary whim of the conqueror. Not even the philosophers could be fooled on that point. All were gripped in the ring of an iron necessity which men could refer to as Fate (*Heimarmene*), or Chance (*Tyche*), or the gods. Thus we observe as characteristic of this Greek period a mood of fatalism and resignation. In place of the personal God, as indicated, came in the thought of Fate or Chance; and the warm personal thought of God gave place to the thought of an impersonal, unfeeling world-government. This applies not only to the Greeks but to the Hebrews and the people of Asia Minor. The Pharisees in less degree and the Essenes in full degree shared this outlook. The position of the Pharisees was synergism, which asserts both moral freedom and mechanical fate: the Essenes were wholly deterministic and so was Ecclesiastes. Personal religion passed away, and prayer ceased to have meaning.

Many turned to skepticism or to superstition. Loftier spirits might still seek in some measure to control life. If man is not free to control his own life, he can at least have lordship over the moment and exploit the present hour. *Carpe diem* becomes the guiding principle. So we find

the philosophers and sages urging the enjoyment of life, some more philosophically like Aristippus and Epicurus, others more practically, as the Hebrew Sages. Here the individual may have a little domain within which he can move freely. To build this domain with respect to the fundamentals of morality is worth effort.

Put away Sorrow, have thy heart's Delight,
Practice no Hardship or ascetic Rite,
But think from whence thou art, and whither bound,
Before the Evil Days come on thee quite:

The Days when thou wilt say, "I do not care,"
When all the Light of Heaven will seem less fair,
Days without Sunshine, when, the Showers past,
The Clouds still gather in the murky Air. (11:10-12:2)

That is the world of Ecclesiastes and that is the mood that characterized that ancient Oriental-Occidental world. Israel was not unaffected by all this, though her Sages assumed the defensive. But Ecclesiastes is unique among those Sages, though he stands within the world of Judaism. He has lost much, but not everything. He is far removed from the temper of the Psalmists or Job, and he stands coolly aloof from his fellow sages. Ecclesiastes is poorer spiritually than Jesus ben Sirach (*Ecclesiasticus*), but he is more independent. Like Job he is an honest thinker, and surely God loves honest thinkers. *Ecclesiasticus* is Jewish, but Ecclesiastes is of the world.

Small wonder is it that this book had difficulty in gaining entrance to the Canon. Such books should not be written (12:12-14)—or should they? But it was finally dressed up in suitable garb by the wise man (*chakam*) who scattered his wise saws through the volume and by the pious *chasid* who gave it an air of godliness. Ecclesiastes would surely have been tickled to death to see what men finally made of his *Journal Intime*, and he would surely have felt mighty queer in the company with which he was finally classed! Here we have another side to Judaism: we know the Psalmists, the Prophets, and the wild-eyed Apocalyptists, but this is something new and strange. Jerome could find in it a manual to teach world renunciation, Comenius found it a book of consolation, while to Frederick the Great it was the most precious book of the Bible. Renan thought it the only lovable book written by a Jew. There must be something in it to elicit such large approval, and from such varied quarters. Perhaps we should say the book is valuable from the side: it shows a world without hope and demonstrates the need of a new era.

Ecclesiastes, like the first part of Goethe's *Faust*, may, with the fullest justice be called an apology for Christianity, not as containing anticipations of Christian truth . . . but inasmuch as it shows that neither Wisdom nor any other human good or pleasure brings permanent satisfaction to man's natural longings.⁴

Ecclesiastes represents the bankruptcy of human thinking and the barrenness of egoism. Egoism had to give place to altruism, and selfishness had to make way for service.

In faith, hope, and love Ecclesiastes was very poor: in truth he was strong. He would not make his judgment blind. He was a seeker after truth, and that is why he still lives.

⁴ Cheyne, T. K., *op. cit.*, p. 249.

A
in th
the r
decad
ralist
scene
of hi

walk
athlet
mouth
tinctly
ested
or bu
probab
his fir

But s
some
roma
evil r
at lea

Other
was c
flouri
conte
about
he p
quick

¹ p
² 7

R
School
to Yal

A New Literary Hero

ROBERT W. LYNN

A NEW LITERARY HERO has been born. Our contemporaries, in their frenzied search for some untouched stock figure, have rediscovered the minister. No longer is the Protestant clergyman the policeman for a decadent Puritan morality, as he was pictured in much of American naturalistic fiction. Elmer Gantry has been shoved aside as part of outmoded scenery. Into the spotlight has stepped the new leading man. Let one of his main proponents, Agnes Sligh Turnbull, describe his entrance:

At nine o'clock on a bright March morning a young man in his first thirties walked slowly along High Street. He was tall with the shoulders and waist of an athlete. His gray eyes under unusually fine brows were thoughtful, but his wide mouth held a quirk of humor as though it smiled easily. His clothes were distinctly well tailored and he wore them with easy nonchalance. A stranger if interested enough to hazard a guess might have set him down as a handsome young lawyer or business man with his feet well set upon the ladder of success. They would probably not have surmised that he was a clergyman coming to assume the duties of his first large parish. . . .

Mrs. Turnbull's first description of her hero is really quite modest. But soon it becomes apparent that he is more than just young and handsome. He reveals astonishing flexibility; by turns he is sentimentally romantic with his wife, ruthlessly practical with recalcitrant vestrymen or evil men of the world, yet always religious if not downright otherworldly, at least in the eyes of the twentieth century. An amazing literary creation!

Just where did this quixotic knight in clerical garb come from? Others might claim he was drawn from life. I rather doubt that. No, he was created out of an artistic vacuum, the luckless victim of a new but flourishing literary tradition. There is plenty of evidence to back up this contention. In the last five years the market has been flooded with novels about Protestant ministers. James Street was among the pioneers when he published *The Gauntlet* in 1945.¹ After this novel others came quickly—Elsie Oakes Barber, *The Wall Between*;² Agnes Sligh Turnbull,

¹ Doubleday & Company, 1945.

² The Macmillan Company, 1946.

ROBERT W. LYNN, B.A., a graduate of Princeton, is a student at Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut, and is now pinch-hitting as Presbyterian minister to Yale students.

The Bishop's Mantle; ³ Nelia Gardner White, *No Trumpet Before Him*; ⁴ and the most recent, Paul Wellman, *The Chain*. ⁵

The significance of these books cuts two ways. Most important is the hidden motif behind this amazing resurgence. It is questionable whether the American reading public of the 1920's would have been avidly interested in the work of a young clergyman. Today we thirst for affirmation, for reassurance in the midst of crisis and decay. Unconsciously perhaps the public seeks the spiritual hero, the modernized Messiah, whether he be in politics or fiction. These books are in part a response to our contemporaries' unspoken demand.

But the writers in question are linked together by more than a common concern to meet the spiritual hunger of our age. Indeed, they appear to be working with exactly the same material. Behind each novel is a common core of tradition.

After recognizing the comic mistakes of those who trace literary genealogies, I would like to make a bold guess. The granddaddy of these novels is *One Foot in Heaven*. ⁶ It all started with Hartzell Spence. His formula was simple. It was a variation on the Horatio Alger myth. Here is the "practical parson who overcomes all the obstacles—a sour-voiced soprano or an unimaginative group of laymen—to win complete triumph and at last establishes both feet in the Kingdom. To make it more palatable, Spence packaged this simple success story of his father's ministry with a thin wrapping of humor which relied more upon ancient joke books and folklore than it did upon the reality of one man's life. All of this was a shameless appeal to a businessman's civilization that stressed "getting ahead" even if it involved blackmail and other disreputable maneuvers.

But Spence misgauged his opportunity and his audience. Actually, he had a wonderful chance to portray how a minister could span the life of the horse and buggy era and the modern age and still make the Christian gospel relevant. Secondly, he underestimated the spiritual temper of his audience. They were not only interested in the life of a practical parson; indeed, they were interested in the life of *anyone* who had something to say to their problems. Hartzell Spence, for all of his facile cleverness, never plumbed these depths.

But he had set the pattern for future writers. The central theme was the conflict between the minister and his congregation. Only slight changes were needed. Take the story out of its biographical form and

³ The Macmillan Company, 1947.

⁴ The Westminster Press, 1948.

⁵ Doubleday & Company, 1949.

⁶ McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1940.

cast it into the mold of a novel. The minister becomes young and handsome; his wife assumes the proportions of a buxom heroine out of the Restoration period. Add the suspense of sexual attraction between the idealistic minister and some sinister female; throw in a few perennial social problems. The finished product is the new literary tradition. The stereotype has become formulated, the plot set, and the happy ending already assured.

James Street was the first to exploit this new form. If we measure *The Gauntlet* by its popularity, he scored a direct hit. His maudlin story of a small-town Baptist preacher fighting the bigotry of his congregation evoked an enthusiastic response from the reading public. The Literary Guild trumpeted it as a "spiritual" epic, although the illustrations advertising the book remind one of a livid historical novel on the seventeenth century. Yet when one scratches beneath the surface, there is nothing more than a slight story built upon a shallow understanding of the minister's problems. His training in pulp sheet writing betrayed him into giving a false, sentimental treatment of a potentially great theme.

Nor did his successors escape from this confining form. Elsie Oakes Barber handles her material with greater respect and, I think, with touching sincerity. Her story describes the efforts of Christy Gardner, sophisticated turned minister's wife, to tear down "the wall between" the world of her husband with his expansive faith and her own universe of struggling doubt. But her characters walk in the way of their literary ancestors as described in *The Gauntlet*. "Earnest and lovable Mark Gardner" is no less young, handsome, and capable than London Wingo, hero of Street's novel.

The stereotype receives its fullest expression under the capable pen of Agnes Sligh Turnbull. As a competent craftsman, Mrs. Turnbull has given us a more enticing portrayal of this new stock figure in her work, *The Bishop's Mantle*. Her candidate for the all-American minister is Hilary Laurens, whose lavish endowments were described at the beginning of this article. Her picture of this attractive rector of a large city parish is almost convincing. Like the other writers she is fond of stressing how human Hilary is. His main appeal, like that of London Wingo and Mark Gardner, is that one would not suppose him to be a clergyman.

I have no objection to this emphasis upon the likeable human qualities of the new hero. All three novelists share in a healthy reaction against the pretentious, bombastic ecclesiastic. Yet their characterization is unconsciously influenced by another American tradition—our great

admiration for the "young man going places." London, Mark, and Hilary are recommended to us because they could have been successful in business. The huckster has been transplanted to the religious realm. To be sure, his thought and character have been somewhat spiritualized; but the final outcome is assured from the start. After we have read fifty pages we know that the hero is bound for inevitable success. In my opinion this falsifies the nature of the minister's task. Of course, these "bright young men" succeed in the eyes of the world. They might bind up the wounds of a broken church, clear the slums, and win great popularity. Does that mean they have succeeded in the eyes of God? How can we measure a man's success in doing the work of God? Sometimes it seems as if the novelists have reduced the indefinable depths of the Christian ministry to the level of discernible accomplishment.

In *No Trumpet Before Him*, by Nelia Gardner White, Paul Phillips, of the First Church of Warrenton, is a refreshing exception to this stereotype. Although he, too, is young and handsome, it is by no means as clear that he will succeed. He did not achieve the lofty, dignified pulpit of Warrenton's best church by the velvet-voiced oratory of London Wingo (*The Gauntlet*) or of Hilary Laurens (*The Bishop's Mantle*). Rather, he stumbled into this plush appointment despite a series of failures in smaller churches. Soon his stubbornness, a lack of tact born out of uncompromising honesty, leads him into a dangerous duel with his congregation. He toils over the same problems that Mark Gardner and Hilary Laurens faced.

All three are concerned with reconverting their complacent, upper-middle-class followers, with housing projects in slum areas, and with carrying the Christian gospel to all people. In the other two novels there is little doubt in the reader's mind that the heroes will triumph over these obstacles. Mrs. White, however, is much more realistic and artistically imaginative in her treatment. Not until the climax is reached do we know if Paul Phillips will win out. No amazing conversions of his enemies are won by the magical wand of his words or presence. Nor are these difficult problems resolved in the space of a few months. In that sense, *No Trumpet Before Him* is psychologically plausible. But is the ending probable? Is the sudden conversion of Miss Pyne convincing? I raise these points as questions because of my own uncertainty. In any case, Mrs. White has offered us a character strikingly devoid of the stereotyped qualities of the new literary hero.

In all other respects, however, *No Trumpet Before Him* is pretty

standard fare. The supporting cast is straight out of the pork barrel. Such machine-tooled characterizations as Mr. Byington, the stuffed-shirt board member who attempts to squelch Paul Phillips, could easily be replaced by Henry Alvord, the arch-conservative vestryman in *The Bishop's Manile*. Or either one of these could be interchanged with Walter Ferguson, the villain of *The Wall Between*. None of these novelists are particularly subtle in their character portrayals. They deposit all the evil of the modern world in the hands of a few reactionaries. Moreover, the congregations are pictured as being too weak-minded or indifferent to defy the dictatorship of these men. In the midst of this unrelieved blackness move a handful of "good" laymen. Interestingly enough, these are the ones who always align themselves with the young minister. Dr. Thoreau Bean (*The Gauntlet*), Judge Ball (*The Bishop's Manile*), and Mr. Atwater (*The Wall Between*) come out of the same mold. Inevitably they protect and defend the gallant knight against his evil opponents.

This clear-cut delineation between the "good" and the "bad" laymen makes the task of the artist far more simple. Once the battle lines are drawn, then all he (or she) has to do is to describe the ensuing battle. Yet this pattern has several serious inadequacies. First, it implies a condescending attitude toward the laity. Without excusing the average church from its many frailties, we can safely assume that its members will not fall so readily into either of these two rigid categories. Every congregation is a tangled web of good and bad intentions, of honesty and deceit. Can we ever separate the goats from the sheep in such an easy fashion as these novelists have done?

A far more dangerous consequence of the stereotype is its elevation of the young pure-minded clergyman to a heavenly pedestal. The minister is pictured as battling the principalities of evil that always rage without and never within himself. Much of this uncritical attitude toward the hero comes from Hartzell Spence's idealized version of his father. While such a vision appeals to my ego, I must reject it. From our limited perspective of experience within the church, it simply does not correspond to reality. For if we accept this idyllic dream, then we rush out to save humanity, only to have our lances broken against the stony indifference of the world. Likewise it breeds disillusionment for those "out there" who expect the brave warrior on his white steed, only to receive a bewildered young man.

Something quite significant has happened here. A novel so fruitful of fantasies is not a work of art. Great literature (Shakespeare and Milton,

for instance) does not create any false dreams about our experience. These novels do. To keep a proper perspective let us distinguish between a major and a minor illusion. Perhaps one might excuse these writers' standardization of the minister's wife as a "beautiful young thing." Alexa Laurens (*The Bishop's Mantle*), Christy Gardner (*The Wall Between*), Kathy Wingo (*The Gauntlet*), and Caroline Phillips (*No Trumpet Before Him*)—all have their problems, not only of adjusting to parish life, but of keeping their naïve husbands out of the clutch of some "wife of Potiphar." Personally, I accept this as pure nonsense, as a concession to our American obsession with sex. There is no great harm done in perpetuating this minor myth.

But a very serious charge still remains. *Their sentimental portrayal of a Protestant minister is the biggest illusion in modern fiction.* The cardboard character who stalks through these four novels has no counterpart in reality. Unfortunately, not one of these novelists has transcended the cliché-ridden concept of the young minister which has sprung up in the last few years. The stereotype still holds them prisoner. They cannot create; they can only imitate.

By these rambling reflections I have hoped to raise one crucial issue. Can we hope that any contemporary writer will escape the stereotype portrayal of the minister? It is with such a question in mind that I approached Paul Wellman's newest work, *The Chain*. At first glance his work is highly orthodox, conforming in all respects to the pattern set by the other books. A courageous Episcopal priest wages war on the narrow exclusiveness of his flock. There are the usual rascals—the quasi-Christian industrial magnate and the elderly bank president who oppose the hero. Sex enters in the shapely form of the magnate's beautiful divorced daughter, who bears a startling resemblance to Jeanne Vane of Warrenton (*No Trumpet Before Him*). In short, the novel has the necessary ingredients for a best seller. As for its artistic integrity, I think we must reserve judgment. *The Chain* suffers from the malady of its predecessors—a competent if not sleek over-all statement of mawkish sentiments. Also, most of the supporting characters are straight from literary folk-land.

Only one thing lifts Wellman's novel out of the current morass of literary mediocrity. His characterization of the young priest, Father Carlisle, is a valiant attempt to break through the mold and create a fresh, genuine portrait of a Protestant minister. When Father Carlisle enters the stage on page sixteen, he is just "a man with a clerical collar, a priest of some kind." Another actor, nothing more. But after the last curtain

has
critic
The
bodi
port
beyo
itual

the a
Thos
who
exper
But
impo
is."
exper
plane
we, t

perso
as "v
uniqu
thing
the re

throu
warpe
religio
reactio
offend
verse,
deny
her se
intrud
and n
explai
offers

I
jaundi

has fallen, no one can say anything, not even the most jaded literary critic. For here is pure gold, woven in with many frayed ordinary strands. The total tapestry is not great literature. Yet the spiritual reality embodied in this man of God impresses itself upon the other character portrayals in the novel. His presence gives them a dignity above and beyond their just deserts as literary creations. And in the end this spiritual reality becomes inscribed in our hearts.

Father Carlisle is a mystery. That effect is partially achieved through the author's artistic concealment of his exact identity until the very end. Those around him sense Father Carlisle to be somebody different, a person who has come to them from a world other than their limited circle of experience. He evokes at first curiosity, then wonder and amazement. But when the denouement finally occurs, "who he is" is no longer the important question. His past is significant only as it explains "what he is." The dramatic suspense is more than just the excitement we might experience over an unsolved murder case. Wellman raises us to a high plane of intensity where we are confronted by this personality so that we, too, must penetrate the mystery, What is Father Carlisle?

Ordinarily we do not speak of a man in those pedantic terms. A person is a "who," not some impersonal identity that can be addressed as "what." However, John Carlisle was both. While he remained a unique and forceful personality to his death, he also represented something more. Accompanying him was the presence of a reality beyond the realm of human achievement.

It is intended irony on the author's part that we discover this reality through the eyes of Gilda, the world-weary divorcee. In spite of her warped outlook, she is the only one who eventually appreciates Carlisle's religious depth. Certainly that is not her avowed intention. Her first reaction to him is a mixture of revulsion and attraction. His asceticism offends her; instinctively she regards it as an assault upon her little universe, her treasure of worldly comforts and pleasures. Yet Gilda cannot deny his strange magnetism. Like a moth drawn toward light, she deserts her self-contained orbit to seek him out, to destroy him as an unwanted intruder in her life. But with each foray into his world she becomes more and more his unwilling prisoner. Love, she concludes, is the only explanation for her unusual behavior. Hesitantly, then confidently, she offers her love, all her bodily gifts to him.

In her expectations she is a child of the modern era. To our jaundiced eye, love appears only as romantic love. Like Gilda, we have

been trained by the soap operas and Hollywood to equate love with moonlight and kisses. However, Father Carlisle's response to her amorous overtures shocks Gilda (and the reader) into realizing the proportions of the true Christian. Instead of caresses he returns a love, no less direct or personal, yet somehow purged of possessive desire. Discipline wrought out of years of deprivation has cleansed his soul of the sensual.

Fortunately *The Chain* is more than a pious success story of soul over body. Too often in the ersatz world of fiction the spiritual man has been a distorted image of the sensual man. Whatever the sensual man affirms, the Christian must deny; his antiseptic goodness is only "good" because it is the colorless opposite of evil. Out of this misunderstanding of the nature of spirituality has emerged a vicious caricature of the Christian as a bundle of negations, a spiritual eunuch lacking vitality or appeal. Even in Dostoevsky's masterpiece, *The Brothers Karamazov*, Alyosha, the spiritual man, seems pale and insipid beside Dmitri, the sensual man.

The recent rash of novels about ministers is a significant protest against this drab view of the Christian. Mrs. Turnbull, Mrs. Barber and company, resent the uninspiring character who has been exalted as the spiritual man. In his place they have put the attractive young man described in this article. But the new spiritual hero is still an alien to the world of New Testament conviction. His admirable deeds are the result of youthful energy and ambition, not the distinctive accomplishments of Christian love as described in I Corinthians 13.

Paul Wellman succeeds where his contemporaries have failed. Father Carlisle is just as exciting and dangerous to Gilda after his disavowal of romantic intentions as he was before. His power of attraction is far more than unalloyed physical charm. Burning within Carlisle is a spiritual vitality which sets him apart from the passive creature of meek humility. T. S. Eliot, in one of his poems, speaks of Christ as a tiger devouring sinful, complacent mankind. Wellman's hero reflects this same intrusive quality of personality. In each encounter his presence is arresting, demanding of some commitment. What Gilda discovers and surrenders to is "the immense white purity of a man's soul."

The followers of London Wingo, Hilary Laurens *et al* might claim to share in Gilda's experience. They, too, have discovered the spiritual man. Note, however, that the "new literary hero" in the other novels never points beyond himself. His own personality has become the object of final religious devotion. Gilda's reverence for Carlisle does not end in the idolatrous worship of the man. The event of revelation begins

when she shifts her attention from the question, "who he is," to the mystery, "what he is." For his purity is a bridge which links her to the ultimate holiness of God. "What he is" is no longer a mystery. Father Carlisle is a *man of God*—not the object of a faith which has degenerated into a sentimental attachment to the "spirituality" of a minister.

My final plea is not for "more books like this." The task of the Christian artist is much more difficult than an exploitive imitation of the past. First, he must know his own world; he must study his contemporaries as thoroughly as John Dos Passos or any other skilled naturalist. And then he must be aware of the world of the New Testament, of its understanding of sin and of the reality of grace and Christian love. Finally, the artist must fuse these two worlds together so that he views the material for his creation through the eyes of faith. Modern fiction suffers not from a lack of artistic technique, but from a blindness of vision, a loss of the Christian perspective. In turn we must confess the literary impotence of our present "Christian" literature. To condemn the current literary success formulas is only a partial cure. We can banish the new literary hero from future novels; but the void will still remain. Our greatest need is for the writers who can distinguish between the appearance and reality of love, and who can persuade without an obvious didacticism that our salvation is in Jesus Christ.

What Is Good Church Music?

ALLAN BACON

DURING THE PAST FEW YEARS the problem of our church music has been thrust rather vigorously into the limelight. A number of magazine articles, editorials, "letters to the editor," etc., from pulpit, organ loft, and pew, have all contributed to give the subject a very healthy publicity. Many sincere church-goers all over the country seem to be of the opinion that the music in a large proportion of our Protestant churches is of a very low order indeed. Epithets such as "trash," "musical blasphemy," and "sacrilege" have been bandied about, and one gets the impression that something really ought to be done about it.

Now this is all to the good, for in a democratic society all true reform should begin at the bottom, with publicity and free, uninhibited discussion as a prerequisite. However, it is one thing to agree that there is a great amount of trash emanating, in the name of music, from organ, choir loft, and pew; but agreement as to what should be done about it does not seem to be so easy. If we begin our discussion by admitting at the outset that much of the music in our churches is "bad church music," the question then may legitimately be raised: What is *good* church music? Some agreement must be arrived at, a basic definition must be accepted, ere a satisfactory discussion can be entered into.

It may be well to begin—as a good contractor does in preparing to build a house—by removing such obstacles as may hinder us in our work. Certain extraneous and irrelevant data should be recognized for what it is, and eliminated at the outset. For example, all musical criticism must rest upon some basic presupposition, some universally valid objective standard or criterion; and any piece of music, whether it be "secular" or "sacred," is judged good or bad as we hold it up for comparison with that criterion. And it is apparent that no criterion based upon the composer's technique, his use of the so-called elements of musical composition such as form, harmony, melody, rhythm, etc., can lay claim to universal validity. An acceptable definition of "music" which makes use of the word "technique" has yet to make its appearance. The history of musical criticism

ALLAN BACON, A.A.G.O., M. Mus., is head of the Organ Department at the Conservatory of the College of the Pacific, Stockton, California, and has made concert tours in this country and in Canada.

is strewn with the wrecks of criticisms leveled against men such as Monteverde, Bach, Beethoven, Wagner, Debussy, and others, for their novel use of these same elements of musical composition—in other words, their technique, or style of writing. These men all survived the attacks of their contemporary critics; they belong among the immortals, the geniuses of history, and their works are just as alive and vital today as on the day they were written.

Any definition of good church music, then, which involves any of these elements of musical composition can scarcely be valid. We cannot insist, for example, that church music, in order to be "good," must conform to any certain or prescribed style, or technique, or "school." We cannot say, "*Good* church music must be polyphonic," or must be "homophonic," or must not be "operatic," etc. Any of these criteria, while they might be valid for a few individuals, would be hotly rejected by as many others, and so could not claim universal validity. A criticism based upon any such criteria would be merely an expression of a personal opinion and as such would belong entirely in the subjective realm.

Good church music must be functional; it must serve the purpose for which it is intended. People go to church hoping that they may be brought into the presence of an unseen power for good which will help them toward a deeper spiritual life; in other words, they go to church to worship God. What they desire is a spiritual quickening or rebirth, and any music sung or performed at the service should assist to that end, else it has no excuse for being. Good church music, then, is music which is used as an adjunct to church worship, which will assist in bringing the worshipers into the presence of God. If it fails in that respect, then it is not good church music but bad.

With this in mind, then, let us consider the role and the function of the organist and musical director in a church. It is plain to see that it is as important as that of the minister himself. The problem of what music should be played or sung is a serious one. It is one thing to agree upon a functional definition of what good church music should be, in theory; but its practical application is of extraordinary complexity, requiring a combination of a keen knowledge of human nature and the wisdom of a Solomon. If we agree, then, that good church music is that which can be used as an integral part of church worship, and that its function is to help make possible a true religious experience on the part of the worshiper and to assist in bringing him into the presence of God—the difficulty in practical application lies in the fact that congregations are made up of a

number of individuals, and no two human beings are exactly alike in ideals, educational or cultural background, taste, or previous conditioning and environment. To one accustomed to a fare of Bach, Palestrina, and Sowerby, the musical agenda of a Salvation Army meeting would be repugnant and could scarcely contribute to any true religious experience. On the other hand the Salvation Army habitu , subjected to Bach fugues and Palestrina motets, would be afflicted with tedium, boredom, or worse. Let someone strike up "It's the old-time religion" or "Throw out the lifeline," and he would join in, heart and soul. Between these two extremes there exist an infinite number of levels or gradations in musical taste and preference, and every congregation will contain individuals representing these levels. Just as it is a biological fact that no two individuals are exactly alike, so is it true that no two persons seated together in the pew will have exactly the same ideas as to what they like to sing or hear the choir sing or the organist play. Their tastes may be similar, but never identical.

Recently an eastern organist tried an experiment. The congregation, as they came into the church for the service, were handed slips of paper with the numbers of the hymns to be sung typed thereon. Opposite each number was written "Too fast," "Too slow," "Just right," with the request that each person put a check mark after the phrase which most nearly described his own personal reaction to the way the hymn was sung during the service. These slips were collected after the service and contents noted and examined with much interest by the organist. To his amazement he found that all three phrases had been checked in fairly equal proportion. From this survey it would seem that your organist is perpetually "wrong" with two-thirds of his congregation. He is confronted by somewhat the same dilemma or handicap as a baseball player coming up to bat, only to find that two strikes have already been called on him!

Now, we opened our discussion a moment ago by admitting that there was an undue amount of trash (i.e. bad music) being performed in our Protestant churches nowadays, and we even agreed that something really ought to be done about it.

As a matter of fact, things are not as bad, in my personal opinion, as some of the critics would have us believe. There always has been trash sung and performed in our churches; but things are getting better, not worse. Standards are rising, not being lowered. Our music schools (the finest in the world) are turning out a never-ending stream of well-trained organists and choir directors, men and women who know their stuff and

who
out
of
a g
Bach
esta
tell
play
dem

adop
why
the
solu
mus
to a
bette
it is
the
be d
way,
ards,
be le
dicta
not

musi
of th
matt
upon
Orph
whic
whic
a ga
whic
in It
can h

1.
not po

who, as soon as they assume authority in any given locale, proceed to carry out the principles and standards acquired during their training. But some of the more intemperate critics apparently envisage a situation wherein a group of highly trained specialists with a predilection for Palestrina, Bach, *et. al.*, purists, "musical Brahmins" as it were, would take over and establish a kind of musical fascism or dictatorship, with supreme power to tell other organists and directors and pastors exactly what music shall be played or sung in choir loft and pew. Such a thing is unthinkable in a democratic society.

From our discussion up to this point one might gather that I was adopting a "defeatist" attitude; if some people are low-brows, musically, why bother to try to change or educate them? Let me hasten to assure the reader that such is not the case. Education is, in my opinion, the only solution to the problem. But it is well to keep in mind that the process must needs be a slow and a gradual one. If we confess, as many of us do, to a "categorical imperative" to do what we can to help our brothers to a better understanding and appreciation of the very best in all forms of art, it is only because of our conviction that all great art enriches life, and that the satisfactions they will derive from that appreciation and enjoyment will be deeper and more lasting. "Behold, I show you a yet more excellent way," said the apostle; and all we can do is keep on trying. High standards, either in the field of esthetics, of religion, or of public morals, cannot be legislated or achieved by act of Congress or by the *ipse dixit* of some dictator of good taste. Or, as a colleague of mine puts it, you simply cannot ram good musical taste down people's throats.

The great geniuses of the past made contributions to the cause of musical progress which were priceless and imperishable—but the people of their time did not so regard them or their works. It has always been a matter of education, and that is a slow process, "precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little, there a little." Gluck (c. 1750), whose opera *Orpheus* is a classic milestone in the development of opera, wrote operas which were an enormous improvement over the current Italian opera, which at that time had sunk to an all-time low and was little more than a gaudy, shallow "costumed recital." But his solid, musicianly style, which made real intellectual demands upon the audience, was not popular in Italy. "Forsooth," they said, "why should we pay to hear him? We can hear that sort of thing in church—and for free."¹

¹ This was nearly two hundred years ago. Wagner, Strauss, and other German composers are still not popular in southern European countries.

One of the most difficult problems connected with our church music lies in the use of music which has formerly been associated with words or ideas of a definitely secular or "worldly" nature. While it is true that musical tones do not, *in themselves*, possess any inherent or intrinsic quality which makes them either sacred, secular, lewd, worldly, or heavenly (for these things are all human concepts, and musical tones belong in the physical world and do not recognize human concepts), nevertheless it is also true that we humans do "read into" or interpret musical sounds, or combinations of sounds, in a variety of ways. By association of certain words, or ideas, with certain tones or groups of tones we may finally grow to feel that these sounds actually mean what the words say! Music does, it is true, express various *abstract* aspects of motion, its retarding, hurrying, hesitancy, delay, etc. These abstractions tend to suggest to us certain human interpretations, such as anticipation, climax, frustration, joy, exaltation, fulfillment, etc., but the tones themselves do not actually *mean* these things. *We* have supplied the meaning.² As a result of this process, music succeeds in creating in us definite moods, or soul-states, in which we dream dreams and see visions. These dreams and these visions are shaped and conditioned by our previous background, education, experience, etc. That is why no two people hearing the same piece of music will have the same experience. Each will interpret it in his own way.

Now in the history of our church music, this problem has presented itself many times and in many ways. The music of the early Christian church was undoubtedly influenced largely by traditions carried over from the Jewish synagogues. Beginning with pure, simple melodies lifted right out of the background of Jewish tradition, the hymns (unaccompanied) used in congregational worship gradually began to exhibit "corrupting" influences. Folk melodies began to be introduced, for greater variety, no doubt, and to give the people more tunes that they were familiar with and which they could sing readily. And the connotations back of some of these folk melodies, even though coupled on Sundays with "sacred" words, was undoubtedly as inappropriate then as it was in Luther's time—or today, for that matter! When finally instruments began to be introduced, ancestors of our modern flute, oboe, trumpet, etc., and associated inseparably in the minds of the people with the pagan festivals of the times

² As a perfect example of what I mean, when I was at one time organist and choir director in a small church, at the close of our rehearsal when the choir (volunteer) was getting ready to leave, I would sometimes play as a friendly gesture the first four chords of "Goodnight, Ladies!" It was my way of saying "good-by" to them, collectively, and was so interpreted by them. But let someone try the experiment on a choir over in France, say, or Germany, and he would discover that there is nothing inherently "valedictory" in those four chords!

(circuses, gladiator combats, the burning of martyr Christians), the good church fathers decided it was time to call a halt. Thus it was that at the Council of Laodicea in A.D. 367 all instrumental music was banned and congregational singing was abolished, and an elaborate liturgy was gradually worked out which was to be sung by priest and choir. These reforms of Pope Gregory, as they have come to be called, did succeed in remedying the evils they were aimed at; but they cropped up again over a thousand years later, in Luther's day, in very similar form—but with a strikingly different solution.

The connection between words and music is, as we have hinted previously, far stronger than most people imagine. At times they become practically inseparable; but once the tune becomes divested of the words and begins to stand on its own feet *as a tune*—well, some interesting things have happened in history. In bringing back congregational singing, to be sung in the vernacular, Luther found it necessary to have tunes, singable tunes. Composers of his day produced a few, but most of these were rather heavy-footed and stodgy. He needed tunes with *élan* and *verve*. Where did he finally get them? Well, we are told that he got some of them literally out of the streets (shades of our early Christian fathers!), folk tunes which had been sung by the rabble, with secular, even obscene, words attached. But these tunes served his purpose surprisingly well. They were sturdy, vigorous tunes which, when harmonized and with with the addition of a sacred text, took their permanent place in his hymnal. Of course, there was a temporary interim during which there was much scandal and protest. Good burghers were shocked on coming to church to hear the organ playing and the congregation singing a tune they had heard only the night before in the streets—and with “worldly” words. But in time the secular words of the tunes were forgotten and the new generation learned to venerate the tunes and to associate them with the words in the hymnal. Nothing inherently lewd or vulgar in the music itself, you see.

Another example which comes closer home is our familiar national anthem. Few people know that the tune of our “Star-spangled Banner” was originally a drinking song called “To Anacreon in Heaven,” which was popular in the early nineteenth century. Our national anthem—that is, the music with which we are familiar—had its first performance in a barroom! Now that we know this, does it make a particle of difference? Of course not. It is still a good tune, albeit a little unsingable. The words? Pardon me, but it is music we are discussing!

A more flagrant example has to do with a melody in one of the scenes

in Saint-Saens' opera *Samson et Dalila*. It is one of the most beautiful and expressive melodies ever written, especially for a dramatic contralto. Violinists have got hold of this melody and play it frequently. It has been my lot to be present when an innocent young violinist, quite unaware of its inappropriateness, played this melody at a church service. Knowing as I did the words attached to the melody ("My Heart at Thy Sweet Voice"), and recalling the scene in the opera where Delilah is seducing Samson, I confess to having experienced a rather bad time at that service. What the reactions of other listeners were I know not. It is, of course, quite conceivable that a time may come when Saint-Saens' opera will be forgotten and only the melody (a really fine tune) remembered, as happened in Luther's time. History may repeat itself. But even Luther was roundly denounced for his "sacrilege" by many of his followers; and in the meantime any organist who allows this piece to be performed at a service should be shot.

The old truism *de gustibus non disputandum* has many variants, especially in the field of music. Organists are fortunate in one respect. Sitting at our console and unraveling the intricacies of a great fugue, and piling climax upon climax, we come to a point where we actually seem to be partners with the Eternal in the creating—or the recreating—of a great cathedral of tone. It is a tremendous experience. However, many people do not like fugues—or do not understand them, let us say. Some wag has described a fugue as a composition in which the various voices make their entrances, one after the other, and those in the audience make their exit, one after the other. A good friend of mine (who happened to be a college president) once confided to me that he did not care for Bach fugues. But he did like "Londonderry Air," and was happy on those rare occasions when I would unbend to play it for him. To most people music, as an organized art form, is a foreign language. They know practically nothing about its grammar and syntax—form, harmony, style, technique, etc.—but they "know what they like," and don't mind in the least telling you. After all, people go to church to *worship*, and the music they sing and listen to is a very vital part of that worship. They cannot really worship in a foreign tongue, or if they are bored. In fact, they won't even come to church in the first place if they know they are going to be bored. And of what profit is a church service with the very greatest music ever written sung in the choir loft—to empty pews?

Yes, people come to church to worship, and having worshiped, they should depart better men and women. That, then, is the true test of wor-

ship, and of all adjuncts to worship: does it help bring men into the presence of God? Most organists feel that Bach and Willan, and Vittoria and Sowerby, ought to do that for them. It does for us, so why not for them? But that is merely our opinion. We are looking at things from the vantagepoint of our own perspective or background of previous training and experience. We understand counterpoint, and the intricacies of fugal development, and it thrills us to recreate these tonal masterpieces. No organist can play the *Passacaglia in C Minor* without feeling he has been in contact with an ideal, spiritual world and being spiritually refreshed and rejuvenated through the experience. But we should know better than to expect others, musically untrained, to share this experience with us. Most people want a hymn tune which seems to take hold of them and do things to them, a tune which they can sing with conviction. Music as an art form may be a sealed book to them, and yet they may be fine, cultured people, with excellent taste in other fields. One very good friend of mine, a college professor, tells me there are only two tunes which he can identify with certainty. One of them is "Dixie"—and the other one isn't.

Church music, then, to be an adjunct of worship, should be of a type the people (the worshipers, that is, not just the organist or director) understand, so that it can be a valid reflex or expression of their souls' deepest yearning. Little Susie Jones, for example, daughter of an illiterate sharecropper, likes to go to Sunday school down at the crossroads church because the songs they use there are the kind she likes to sing. There is one in particular she is very fond of: "Jesus Loves Me, This I Know." It seems to suit her childish treble, and she sings it with great earnestness. She is an imaginative child and the words appeal to her. This song and "Jesus Wants Me for a Sunbeam" are her favorites. They both affect her deeply. They make her feel that she is a child of God and that someone above is interested in her and is watching over her. If Jesus really does want her for a "sunbeam," then she must try to be like a sunbeam, and that means being a good girl and helping her mother all she can, doing the dishes and taking care of the baby and getting her lessons at school. She has never heard an organ, and a Bach fugue would be just a jumble of noise—though the big pedal diapasons might thrill her, with their deep tones. The music she sings, however, does something to her which lasts and carries over into her daily life.

Now when I play the great *St. Anne* fugue, I also am affected deeply. The mighty sonorities which pile up, the sense of power and majesty which are created by the stalking appearance of the subject as it makes its various

entrances, all of this does something to me. But I am reminded of a certain episode in the life of our Lord, an incident which took place, we are told, on a "high mountain." There he "was transfigured before them; and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him. Then answered Peter and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here . . . let us make here three tabernacles . . . and a voice . . . said, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him. And the disciples . . . fell on their faces, and were sore afraid."³ What a profound experience this must have been for all three of the disciples present! To them was vouchsafed the revelation of the sonship of their Master to the Father. They must have been actually in the presence of God himself.

Likewise the organist, drilling his choir or rehearsing on his organ the mighty polyphony of the Bach *Magnificat* or the shadowy mysticism of the Franck *Prière*, feels himself lifted up into the very presence of God. Does he benefit by the experience? Does it really make him a better man? Little Susie Jones is a better girl after singing "Yes, Jesus Loves Me." Peter? Well, we know that not long after this tremendous, soul-stirring experience of the Transfiguration he denied his Master, not once but thrice. In all humility I hope and trust that my contact with Bach leaves me a better man spiritually. That is really all that counts.

Two men went up into the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee—or perchance a musical purist, a snob, even such a man as I—and the other a publican, belike a man untrained in music, a man who thought that a "canon" was something used in war. And the Pharisee stood and spoke somewhat as follows: "Lord, I thank thee that I am not as other men, stupid yokels who do not appreciate the beauties of excellent counterpoint, or even as this man here who blasphemes thee by singing trash in his worship service when he could just as well sing the greatest music written to thine honor and glory." And the publican stood afar off, without so much as lifting his eyes to heaven. We do not know what tongue he used in addressing the Deity, or whether he used bad grammar, or spoke a vulgar dialect; but he smote upon his breast: "Lord, be merciful unto me, a sinner." He may have actually tried to sing the words, in a cracked voice, he may have used a musical vernacular, or he may have been a monotone. Would it really matter to the Deity?

"Verily I say unto you, this man went down into his house justified, rather than the other."

³ Matt. 17:2-6.

T
the
Bap
not
wide
prom
Chri
greg
came
as o

Kel
Rev
in t
them
indi
Pop
and
was
It h
relig
whic

(in t
Desp
rega
his c
Chie

Chur
at Sp
its dy

Charles Haddon Spurgeon: An Appreciation

JOHN PITTS

THE FIRST SUNDAY in January, 1950, marks the centennial of the "conversion" of Charles Haddon Spurgeon, probably the greatest Baptist who ever prepared the way of the Lord. The event should not go entirely unnoticed, though it is not likely that there will be any widespread celebration, even in Baptist circles. Spurgeon was a most pronounced denominationalist, hardly to be described as an ecumenical Christian, yet he belongs to the whole Church. He was born in a Congregational parsonage, was converted in a Methodist meetinghouse, became a Baptist minister, and is acclaimed by believers all over the world as one of God's richest gifts to his people.

Spurgeon was born on June 19, 1834, in the picturesque village of Kelvedon, Essex, about forty miles northeast of London. His father, Rev. John Spurgeon, was the pastor of the little Congregational chapel in that place. In those days the Congregationalists preferred to call themselves "Independents" in order to express their sturdy religious individualism. As one of them used to say, they were "independent of the Pope and the devil"; very often they were independent of one another and of their fellow believers in other denominations. Their theology was that of the Puritans, and in this tradition young Spurgeon was reared. It had a profound effect on his character and career. It shaped his early religious experience and lent vivid color to the conversion crisis through which he passed on that January Sunday morning a century ago.

For five years young Spurgeon was under "deep conviction of sin" (in those days the phrase would not have been put in quotation marks). Despite his tender years and his lack of life's deeper experiences, he regarded himself as a vile sinner in the sight of God. He could make his own the vivid language of John Bunyan's *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners*. Indeed, a few years later, as he looked back upon

JOHN PITTS, M.A., Ph.D. (London), is minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Bloomfield, New Jersey. He received his first training for the ministry at Spurgeon's College in London; and has given us an anniversary "appreciation" of its dynamic founder.

this period of his life, he did borrow Bunyan's words to describe what he himself "did smartingly feel" in those dark adolescent days.

I was more loathesome in mine own eyes than a toad. Sin and corruption would as naturally bubble out of my heart as water out of a fountain. I thought that everyone had a better heart than I had. At the sight of my own vileness I fell deeply into despair. . . . I counted the estate of everything that God had made far better than this dreadful state of mind was; yea, gladly would I have been in the condition of a dog or a horse; for I knew that they had no souls to perish under the weight of sin as mine was like to do.

Macaulay, in his famous essay on "John Bunyan," has some scathing things to say about this spiritual morbidity, and it is easy to follow in his train in this respect. It is highly probable that young Spurgeon was a normal boy in every respect—as good as any and better than most. It was his strict theological upbringing that exaggerated his sense of moral failure and moral impotence and led him to accept more than his fair share of the total depravity of the human race. We may recall the lines sometimes attributed to James Thomson, author of *The City of Dreadful Night*:

Once in a saintly passion
I cried in desp'rate grief,
"O Lord, my heart is full of guile;
Of sinners I am chief!"

Then stooped my guardian angel,
And whispered from behind:
"Vanity, my little man,
You're nothing of the kind."

But we must not apply these words to young Spurgeon. There are no signs of vanity or of spiritual pride in the emotional tensions of his pre-conversion days. The Puritan tradition in which he was reared, and the moral rigorism of his home life, undoubtedly gave form to his thoughts and feelings, but the core and substance of the experience was a genuine apprehension and appropriation of the grace and goodness of God.

Young Spurgeon was "born again" on January 6, 1850, in the little Primitive Methodist Chapel in Artillery Lane, Colchester, the old Roman city fifty miles from London. It was a very snowy day. The boy, still under deep conviction of sin, had started out from his home to go to a certain place of worship. He had been making the rounds of the churches of the city for some months, yearning and seeking for some word of light and healing for his dark and wounded spirit. He had listened to many sermons, but not one of them had seemed to fit his particular

and peculiar need. On this snowy Sunday morning he did not reach the place of worship he had selected. The fury of the storm drove him to take shelter in a narrow lane. As he walked along the narrow sidewalk he came to a none-too-inviting-looking meetinghouse belonging to the Primitive Methodists, and although he had heard some unpleasant reports of their "ranting" he decided to go in.

The congregation consisted of about fifteen people in a building capable of seating three hundred. Because the preacher appointed for the day had failed to arrive, a member of the congregation—"a shoemaker or something of that sort"—was pressed into service. It was clear that the Lord had never intended him to be a preacher, for when he got to the sermon all he could do was to give out the text: "Look unto me, and be ye saved all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else." He tried to say something about it, and struggled on ineffectively for about ten minutes. By this time he had come to the end of his oratorical resources and there seemed nothing more he could say.

It was then that the inspiration of heaven descended upon the amateur preacher. Looking toward the boy—obviously a stranger—sitting amid a desert of empty pews under the gallery, he cried out: "Young man, you look miserable; and you will always be miserable—miserable in life and miserable in death—if you do not obey my text. But if you obey now, this moment, you will be saved." Then he shouted, as only a Primitive Methodist could: "Look! Look! Look! It is only a look!" It was just what the boy needed. As he himself afterward expressed it: "I did look; and, there and then, the cloud was gone, the darkness had rolled away, and that moment I saw the sun. I could have risen on the instant and sung with the most enthusiastic of them of the precious blood of Christ and of the simple faith that looks to him alone. Oh, that somebody had told me before!"

Spurgeon, as long as he lived, never tired of telling of his conversion. He wrote a hymn to commemorate the event, the chorus of which goes:

He looked on me; I looked to Him,
And we were one for ever.

In 1865, the Essex lad, who had become England's greatest preacher, returned to what was now to him a most sacred spot and preached a moving sermon—and not to a mere handful of people—on the memorable words: "Look unto me, and be ye saved." "Let preachers study

this story," says Sir William Robertson Nicoll. "Let them believe that, under the most adverse circumstances, they may do a work that will tell on the universe forever. It was a great thing to have converted Charles Haddon Spurgeon; and who knows but we may have, in the smallest and humblest congregation in the world, some lad as well worth converting as he was."

Since the advent of the psychological study of the religious consciousness and religious experience, we all tend to regard conversion as a problem in psychology. It is good that we do so, for we have much to learn about the ways of God with man. We can remind ourselves of the oft-quoted passage from William James' Gifford Lectures, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*: "Conversion is that process, gradual or sudden, by which a self hitherto divided and consciously wrong, inferior, or unhappy, becomes unified and consciously right, superior, and happy, in consequence of its firmer hold upon religious realities." That definition of conversion fits the experience of Spurgeon. It was a characteristically adolescent experience, shaped and determined by a definite theological tradition, colored by a specific religious upbringing, and obeying the laws of mental growth and emotional development. But in our devotion to psychological investigation, let us not forget that conversion is more than a psychological problem; it is an evangelical miracle. Conversion is the human side of a profound and far-reaching spiritual experience which in the New Testament is called regeneration or the new birth. But whether we look at the matter from the divine side or from the human, we must recognize that God is in the transaction, and that consequently regeneration-conversion is a miracle of heavenly grace—something not merely to be speculated about, but also to be wondered at.

C. H. Spurgeon never ceased to wonder at his conversion. It was to him both a miracle in itself and the beginning of miracles in character and service. He sensed that what had happened to him on that snowy Sunday morning in the Methodist meetinghouse had given his life a new direction and a new impulse, both Godward and manward. Ere long he became a Sunday-school teacher, and in this capacity he made his first efforts in public speaking; then he joined the Cambridgeshire Village Preachers' Association; and then—at the early age of seventeen—he became pastor of the Baptist Chapel in the village of Waterbeach, not far from the ancient university city of Cambridge.

This in itself was phenomenal, but there was something much more

spectacular and enduring to come. At nineteen years of age he was called to the pastorate of New Park Street Baptist Chapel, Southwark, in southeast London, not far from the old Tabard Inn, from which Chaucer's Canterbury pilgrims set out on their famous journey. The church was nearly empty, and on the point of closing its doors, when the chubby-faced country lad became the minister. Within a few weeks vast crowds of people, from all over the metropolis, were struggling for admission. So great was the crush that the evening service was transferred to the famous Exeter Hall in the Strand; and again the building was crowded. Then the bold step was taken of hiring the Royal Music Hall, in Surrey Gardens; and for three years Spurgeon preached to nine thousand people every Sunday morning.

It was clear that Spurgeon was no "nine-days' wonder," but had come to stay; that he was no transient meteor in the religious firmament, but a fixed star of rare brilliance. Both the preacher and his supporters realized that the church would have to find a permanent home commensurate with its growth and opportunities, and by 1859 the famous Metropolitan Tabernacle was in the process of construction. Two years later it was opened for public worship, and thereafter for thirty-two years C. H. Spurgeon preached to six thousand people twice every Sunday. And not only on Sundays did the multitudes hang upon his words. The Monday evening prayer meeting attracted fifteen hundred people, whilst the attendance at the Thursday evening preaching service was seldom less than three thousand. In the whole history of Christendom there had been nothing quite like this continuous success.

In addition to his preaching, Spurgeon was a most prolific writer. He founded and edited *The Sword and Trowel*, a monthly magazine with a very large constituency. He reviewed books by the hundred. (Incidentally, he wrote appreciatively of Sir John Seeley's *Ecce Homo*, when most other preachers were bitterly denouncing the book and its author.) He produced *The Treasury of David*, a seven-volume commentary on the Psalms, of which Dr. James Stalker is reported to have remarked that he had been regularly using the commentary for many years and had never found a single error in its pages.* He wrote volumes of homespun philosophy under the pseudonym of "John Ploughman," and published a weekly sermon which found its way to the far-off corners of the earth. (This weekly publication continued for forty years after his death.)

Spurgeon had himself been deprived of the advantages of a college and seminary education (though he had an informed mind and was better educated than his critics would allow), but he was a firm believer in adequate ministerial training. Soon after he came to London he started a "School of the Prophets," which still exists under the name of "Spurgeon's College," and is probably the most influential of British Free Church seminaries. He also established a home for fatherless children, and today "Spurgeon's Orphanage" is perhaps, to the general public, his best-known monument. But it was as a preacher that he did his greatest work, and it is as a preacher that the church will best remember him.

Spurgeon was a great preacher rather than a preacher of great sermons (every preacher can manage to produce half a dozen great sermons in the course of a lifetime!), and his preaching was on a uniformly high level. But some of his sermons stand out above the rest, just as a few peaks stand out above the others in a long and high mountain range. There was the sermon that Spurgeon preached to a congregation of twenty-four thousand people in the old Crystal Palace, London, on October 17, 1857. It was the Day of National Humiliation and Prayer on account of the Indian Mutiny. The preacher was only twenty-three at the time, but he was chosen for the high honor in preference to many older men who might have been regarded as having prior claim. The young man rose to the great occasion as he preached on the word of Micah—so appropriate to the event—"Hear ye the rod, and who hath appointed it."

Another famous preachment of Spurgeon was an Easter sermon on the verse: "She, supposing him to be the gardener"—by many competent critics regarded as the greatest of all Spurgeon's sermons. Yet another famous sermon was called "Punishments Not Accidents" and was based on the gospel incident of the tower of Siloam falling on and killing eighteen innocent bystanders and workmen. Spurgeon's vigorous Calvinism was left in the shadows in this sermon, or perhaps it was merely in solution; but the sermon was a great deliverance nonetheless. David Livingstone carried a tattered and well-worn copy of this sermon into darkest Africa, and it was found amongst his papers after his death. Across the front of the sermon the intrepid missionary had written: "Very good, very true." That legend could be written over most of Spurgeon's sermons. His style is different from ours, and we may find ourselves disagreeing with him on some points of doctrine. But it is great preach-

ing; and John Henry Jowett—himself a prince of preachers—did not exaggerate when he said of Spurgeon: "He is not eclipsed even when set in radiant succession to Paul, Luther, and Calvin."

What was the secret of Spurgeon's phenomenal success as a herald of God? Several factors entered into the secret, fused together in a completely consecrated character. For one thing, Spurgeon had a remarkable voice which he used with consummate skill. For another, he knew how to speak in the language of the common people. For yet another, he "spake as one having authority" and blew the gospel trumpet with "no uncertain sound." To these qualities may be added a prodigious memory, a vivid imagination, an informed and disciplined mind, an amazing facility of speech, and remarkable homiletic skill. But, above all, he had a heart completely devoted to Christ. Christ the Savior was central to his message as he was central to his life. His motto was that of the Moravian, Count Zinzendorf: "I have one passion, and it is He, only He." But when we have said all this, the secret still eludes us. Spurgeon was a genius, and we have to leave the mystery there.

"The common people heard him gladly" and so did others, like John Ruskin and "Mark Rutherford" (William Hale White), who may be regarded as more discriminating hearers than the multitude. Yet Spurgeon was not without his critics, even enemies. In the early days of his ministry most of the London newspapers caricatured him; some even vilified him. These attacks, however, only served to increase the young preacher's hold on the affections of the general public; and as the years wore on this kind of opposition disappeared. But not a few of the literary and theological "highbrows" continued to be critical to the end of his life. In 1886, six years before the great preacher's death, Sir William Robertson Nicoll wrote to a friend: "It is a great mistake of W. to think he has nothing to learn from Spurgeon. And that attitude makes Spurgeon angry and alienated. We cannot overlook facts; and the fact is that the Spurgeonic type of preaching is the only kind that moves the democracy. I know that there are very repulsive elements about all that set of people. But I also know, and so do you, that they are the salt of the earth."

Soon after Spurgeon's death, Dr. Marcus Dods wrote a scathing criticism of the great preacher's life and work. It made Nicoll very angry, and he came to the defense of Spurgeon. He wrote to Dods as follows:

Your paragraph about Spurgeon really vexed me—and it is the only thing you have ever said, or written, or done, that did vex me or that I thought not worthy of your magnanimity. It also amazed me, for never yet did I hear any one speaking of Spurgeon in that way. I never knew any character that impressed itself so deeply on the whole English people—and he was regarded with a most unaffected respect and trust by men of all creeds and none. Everyone knew that he was as straight as an ash. . . . I never knew a sign that his immense popularity turned his head. Rather the other way—it made him often very melancholy and depressed. . . . As to his bigotry—yes, and I had my share of his abuse. But think how slowly the critical light has broken; think what most of us said and did in the days of our darker ignorance; think how incomprehensible it necessarily was to him. As to the weightier matters, he was wiser than the rest. . . . I have read him diligently for years. . . . Every Sunday night I spend at least an hour reading him, and there is no devotional writing that pleases me so well. He was such a very great mystic that I doubt if we have had his like since Behmen. How thin and superficial even Maclaren and Robertson appear beside him!

Charles Haddon Spurgeon died on February 1, 1892, in the south of France, where he had gone to recover from distressing bodily weakness, forty-two years after his dramatic and decisive conversion in the little Primitive Methodist Chapel in Colchester. His body was brought to England for burial and lay in state in front of the pulpit of the great church which his genius had created. Thousands of people, sixty thousand in one day alone, passed by the casket to pay a last tribute of respect to God's great servant. As they did so, they saw an open Bible—open at the forty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, with a blue ribbon marking the memorable verse that had meant so much to him who had now passed into the presence of the Savior: "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else." And Spurgeon's own words, written to commemorate the Great Transaction of January 6, 1850, had become finally and completely and eternally fulfilled:

He looked on me; I looked to Him,
And we were one for ever.

ME
is to
lowin
a res
Testa
Chur

Stoke
1949
lives
the m
all th
ham
of cos
flood
ironc
Ther

such
Glim
a larg
ship
lists
of 16
loving
which
curre
"pers

J.
Federa
here a
and D

The Essence of Christianity— Brotherhood

J. QUINTER MILLER

MENNONITE PEOPLE BELIEVE that the essence of Christianity is to be found in discipleship. Christlikeness comes from faithfully "following after" Jesus Christ, made possible by the strict observance of and a resolute obedience to the teachings and ethical demands of the New Testament. Holding such a faith as this, members of the Mennonite Church are frequently the first to respond to human need.

Such was the case in the flash flood which suddenly descended upon Stokesville and Bridgewater in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia in June, 1949. Houses were washed away, farms were ruined, stores flooded, and lives lost. Stokesville residents, whose poorer houses were located near the north branch of the south fork of the Shenandoah River, lost nearly all their homes. The next morning, Mennonite families from Rockingham County, Virginia, arrived with the offer to rebuild these homes free of cost, including material and labor. A Mennonite laundry came for the flood-drenched contents of a dry-goods store in Bridgewater, washed and ironed the articles, and returned them the next day "spick and span." There was no charge.

What kind of a faith do Mennonite people have that makes them do such things? The answer can be found in Brother Wenger's scholarly *Glimpses of Mennonite History and Doctrine*. The Mennonites are not a large people numerically, but the nature and character of their discipleship is luminous and radiant indeed. The Year Book of the Churches lists fifteen Mennonite bodies in the United States with a membership of 167,065. They are generally a separatist, plain, freedom- and Bible-loving people. The struggle against "statism" and "authoritarianism" which began in the days of the Protestant Reformation and has been recurrent during the war crises of their entire history has helped shape the "personality" of the Mennonite Church.

This Dr. Wenger makes clear. He traces the origin of the Anabaptist

J. QUINTER MILLER, M.R.E., LL.D., is Associate General Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York City. He gives us here a review-article based upon John C. Wenger, *Glimpses of Mennonite History and Doctrine*, Herald Press, Scottdale, Pennsylvania, 1947. pp. xii-258. \$2.25.

Movement in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, portraying the struggle between Zwingli and Luther as state church Protestant reformers, and Conrad Grebel, the founder of the Anabaptist Movement. As the author points out: "Conrad Grebel was led to evangelical faith by Zwingli. But once Grebel began to read God's word . . . he simply had to come to a break with the Roman priest, Zwingli. . . . God had to be obeyed at the cost of liberty, yea, of life itself." Thus Swiss Anabaptism was born. The Swiss Brethren Movement and the Dutch Anabaptists (Obbenites and Mennonites) were parallel developments historically, but they had no organic connection. Their doctrines, however, were quite similar because both groups made a serious effort to reject tradition and to make the Scriptures the sole norm of faith and practice.

Menno Simons, the founder of the Mennonite Church, was a Dutchman of Obbenite origin. He is portrayed as a sane and balanced figure promoting both an evangelical faith and holiness of life. His complete loyalty was to the Word of God.

The story of Menno's conversion is revealing. One day in 1525, as a priest of the Roman Catholic Church, he was celebrating Mass. A doubt crept into his mind concerning the validity of the doctrine of transubstantiation. Did the bread and wine actually become the flesh and blood of our Lord? This doubt resulted in a tremendous soul struggle. "Menno first thought this was a suggestion from the devil, and he tried by using the confessional to get it out of his system." This failing to remove his worry, Menno turned to a study of the New Testament. "This was a most important decision, for in the end it was bound to lead him from the Catholic Church; he had to choose between following the Word of God and following the church." Here we may trace a decisive influence of Martin Luther's teaching upon Menno, that the "ultimate authority in all matters of faith was the Word of God."

"About April, 1535, Menno surrendered to God, crying for pardon and peace. What a decision this was for the Obbenites and for the future Mennonite Church! Strangely enough Menno apparently remained in the Catholic Church for yet another nine months, preaching evangelical doctrines from a Catholic pulpit. But this could not go on indefinitely, and in January, 1536, Menno Simons renounced the Catholic Church and thus took the step which he had known for a long time was God's will for him. . . . Before we criticize Menno for his timidity, we should remember what this step meant for him. It meant that in the eyes both of the world and of the civil authorities he was a heretic of the worst sort,

even more dangerous than an ordinary criminal. While Luther and Zwingli timed and modified their programs to secure political protection, the Anabaptists went bravely ahead and organized a church which they felt was true to the teachings of the New Testament. For this step they were willing to part with possessions, friends, family, and even life itself.

"All Mennonite groups have similar doctrinal standards and agree with each other that the New Testament prohibits participation in warfare and in litigation; that the Christian shall not swear an oath but make only a solemn declaration of the truth; that the Church consists of those who have voluntarily turned from sin and accepted Jesus Christ as the Saviour; that the Christian life involves a separation from the sin of the world, and positively the living of the 'simple life'; that Christians shall not unite with secret orders; that baptism shall be administered only to those who accept Christ, not to infants (who are saved without baptism); and that the Christian congregation shall maintain a Scriptural discipline, excluding from its membership impenitent sinners. The differences between the several conferences of Mennonites relate mostly to their differing attitudes toward such newer institutions of Christendom as the Sunday school, toward the adoption of new inventions in the realms of transportation and communication, and toward newer forms of clothing. While all this may seem amusing to some people, even to the more progressive Mennonite groups, it is nevertheless a testimony to the ethical earnestness and the tender consciences of the brotherhood."

The first significant Mennonite settlement in North America was made in Germantown, Pennsylvania, in 1683. Coming from Crefeld, Germany, the settlers, while mostly members of the Quaker communion, were all of Mennonite background and descent. Later there followed four great waves of Mennonite migration to this continent: the Palatine and Swiss Mennonite migration to eastern Pennsylvania, beginning in 1709 and continuing to 1754; the Alsatian Amish migration, including some Swiss and South German Mennonites, from 1815, at the time of Napoleon, to 1861—the Civil War; and the Russian Mennonite migrations of 1873-1880 to Manitoba in Canada, and 1923-1928 to Canada and South America.

"The Anabaptist concept of the church composed of individual souls who were saved by accepting the Lord Jesus Christ as their Saviour, and who were glorifying God by a holy walk and a life of Christian witnessing, was only one aspect of their view of the church. *They also thought of the church as a corporate body achieving the will of God for society.* This doctrine distinguished them more sharply than any other from the large

Protestant groups. They held that the state had to live its life on a sub-Christian level, restraining unregenerate men by the employment of police force and the magistracy. But when a person became a Christian and accepted baptism he was lifted up into the society of the redeemed, a body of people who loved one another and were mutually concerned for the welfare of their fellow believers and for the corporate witness of the brotherhood, a society in which there was no need of force and coercion. Church discipline aided in keeping this society holy. Here Jesus Christ was sovereign, directing His people by His Word, in the power of the Holy Spirit. His servants, the ministers or teachers in the congregations, were confident that the Holy Spirit would so bless their teaching of the Word that the members of Christ's body, being regenerated believers, would seek to conform themselves to Christ and His Word.

"Needless to say, this vision, if the state churchmen had it at all, was an empty dream for a people's (provincial) church. Such a body did not achieve a high ethical level in Christ. In the state churches one could think of the vertical relation only, the individual soul reaching up to God. It was the Anabaptists who sought earnestly to build Christ's *kingdom* here and now. And that kingdom was not a theoretical concept for them, but a glorious reality, composed, as it was, of their fellow believers, the members of their congregations. . . ."

The essence of Christianity is the Christian life. In the words of the author: "The Anabaptists may never rate as outstanding and erudite theologians, but they did have sound principles of interpretation, as well as the determination to make the Bible alone the norm of their faith and practice. They held to Biblical doctrines of God, man, sin, and salvation. They had a high view of the place and calling of the church, a view which has even today not been realized by Christendom as a whole. Their ethic of love and nonresistance is sorely needed in a world of wars and rumors of war. Upon the Mennonite Church of today rests the responsibility of holding aloft the Anabaptist torch of truth, a lamp which burns with the light of divine revelation, and a beacon which can give guidance to thousands of souls as they grope for the light of life."

In matters of theology the Mennonites are generally of one mind with other Protestants in the leading articles of Christian faith. On the great doctrines of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Trinity, moral depravity and original sin, regeneration, holiness of life, grace and the second coming, the Mennonite Brethren hold common views with Protestant communions generally.

In the great Swiss controversy with Zwingli, the Swiss Reformed

clerg
the l
terna
Zwin
gard
us d
adult

Chris
stress
"non
tenet
move

from
instru
tion,
of the
"The
easier
verts
the de
of life

"
dition
one ha
time,
Most
tism,
comm
feet, a
course
this is

D
ening"
Mover
S

G
R

clergy in the Zofingen debates in 1532 stated: "We are of one mind in the leading articles of faith, and our controversy has to do only with external things which are not in accordance with the gospel. . . ." Again, Zwingli stated: "But that no one may suppose that the dissension is in regard to doctrines which concern the inner man, let it be said that they make us difficulty only because of questions such as these: whether infants or adults should be baptized and whether a Christian may be a magistrate."

The unique Mennonite emphases are: the Bible, the Church, and the Christian life and ethic. Here the reader will see how and why this people stresses the parity in authority of all New Testament commands, while "nonresistance" and "believers' baptism" are the two most distinctive tenets of the Swiss Brethren and Dutch Mennonite faith, out of which this movement has arisen.

The Bible, for example, is considered as the means to redeem men from sin. This practical outlook toward the Bible makes of it a functional instrument in God's hands in dealing with man's salvation and sanctification, which conversely has militated against the erection of a human system of theology. This is aptly emphasized by Dr. Wenger in these words: "There is something wholesome about this point of view. It is much easier to theorize about the order of the divine decrees than to win converts for the Lord Jesus. It is much easier to get an intellectual grasp of the doctrines of Scripture than to apply Scripture to the whole man, to all of life.

"The genius of Mennonitism has been to reject completely the traditional distinction between those New Testament commandments on the one hand which are binding both in form and spirit upon Christians for all time, and those on the other hand which are to be observed only in spirit. Most Christians hold that to the former class belong such items as baptism, communion, and ordination, and that to the latter class belong such commands as to greet one another with a holy kiss, to wash one another's feet, and to anoint the sick with oil. The Mennonites, however, in the course of time began to stress the parity of all New Testament commands; this is of course a parity in authority, not in significance."

Dr. Wenger outlines the elements operative in "The Great Awakening" of the late nineteenth century, attributing to the Sunday School Movement the primary cause for this revival. The Sunday school, he says:

Stopped the exodus of young people from Mennonite homes into
other denominations,
Greatly increased Bible study and Bible knowledge,
Raised the level of spiritual life,

Improved moral life and clean living (total abstinence regarding liquor and tobacco),
 Provided religious activity for the entire membership,
 Developed lay leadership,
 Promoted the rise of missions interest in the church.

The thoughtful reader will be helped by this book to see the close kinship of faith and practice between the three historic "peace churches"—Mennonite, Friends, and Church of the Brethren. The author also contends that the rise of the Mennonite Church as a part of Anabaptism is the logical outcome of the Protestant Reformation. "It was not an unbalanced, bizarre, or fanatical movement. Rather, it represents a more earnest effort than other Protestant groups made to break with religious and ecclesiastical tradition in order to render absolute obedience to the text of Scripture."

Dr. Wenger makes no reference in this significant volume to the question of Mennonite relations to the Ecumenical Movement of our day. He speaks of the "high calling of the church," and emphasizes the Mennonite concept of the church as not only personal acceptance of Jesus Christ as Savior and the need of glorifying God by a holy walk of life and witness, but shows that it is also held that the church is a *corporate body* achieving the will of God for society. He insists that Christ's kingdom is to be built here and now. But there is silence on the part the Mennonite branch of Christ's church is to play in relation to the "corporate body" of Christians—the Christian ecclesia functioning and witnessing within time and space to the good news of the Gospel of Christ.

Is there no "glimpse" in Mennonite history and practice of the churches' ecumenical horizon? Could it be that the experience of controversy and martyrdom which surrounded the origin of the Mennonite Brethren, followed by the persecutions which have attended their loyalty to the pacifist principle of nonresistance throughout their history, so recently re-enacted in this modern period, has blinded them to the ecumenical aspect of the churches' inner nature in Christ and the corporate impact of their life within the Christian fellowship? Much light and understanding is furnished by this volume; but for this reviewer, this question remains unanswered. Surely the Kingdom enterprise could be immeasurably benefited and strengthened by a fuller participation in and sharing of the Mennonite faith, practice, and witness within the co-operative ventures of American co-operative Christianity.

A Review of the Quarter's Fiction

JOHN C. SCHROEDER

IT WOULD BE INTERESTING to speculate on the reasons for Sholem Asch's use of the New Testament as the source for three of his works. Having given us *The Nazarene* and *The Apostle*, he has now published *Mary*. One might presume that he has hoped to show how Christianity and Judaism have much in common and that they are both committed to the worship of the Father of all mankind. He is a loyal Jew; but his studies of these three personages also reveal a sympathetic understanding of Christian origins and beliefs.

However, his presentation of Mary is far removed in spirit and intention from the essentials of the Jewish tradition. While his position about Mary does not match a "high Mariolatry," he does describe her as the mother who, by reason of the miraculous birth of her son, knows that he is a man different from other men not only in degree but in kind. In fact, the theme of the book is the tension in Mary's spirit between the daughter of Israel committed to God's will who knows why her son can perform miracles and the human mother who wants to protect her child. The Gospels themselves never seem to face this dilemma. The Mater Dolorosa is not conceivable psychologically if she had always known how unique her son was. Mr. Asch sees this dilemma and is not convincingly successful in resolving it.

The story weaves the scanty biblical record and a knowledge of the social situation in contemporary Judaism together most skillfully. One sees the pleasant and even life of the family at the beginning, with all the detail of the surrounding culture evident. Even as a child, Jesus' wonder-working powers are evident. Unfortunately, some of the apocryphal miracle stories appear. In these formative years, the teaching of Joseph, who looked for a pacific Messiah, is registered. Even as a child, Jesus is indifferent to forms and ceremonies. But soon evil begins to confront him. He sees the sad plight of the poor. He learns about the depraved worship of the devotees of Astarte and of the Baals. A near-by town is sacked by the Romans and the Arabs.

Once he is baptized, the action in the Gospel narrative is seen through

JOHN C. SCHROEDER, D.D., LL.D., is Master of Calhoun College and Professor of Religion, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

Mary's eyes. She knows the difference between Jesus and the other children, and she is unable to protect him against his divine role. The other children do not understand him. "The child in her arms was not her little Josés only, it was the son of man, questing for a mother-intercessor and lying at her breast that had nourished the salvation of the world." The author breaks with the record in Mark, when he has the rest of the family but not Mary reject the Savior in the courtyard of Simon's house.

When his mission starts, she must become a spectator; and the events of the crowding years are seen and interpreted through her eyes. This section of the book is good narrative, although again as in his childhood, he is the wonder-worker more than he is the teacher. The miracles and other supernatural manifestations are treated in terms of her faith. *Mary* is a book which I was unable to read with great sympathy. It presents a Jesus who is essentially a wonder-worker and a Mary who is sentimentalized. The result is an emasculated piety which is far removed from the sturdy portrayal of a Mark or the compassionate Master of Luke.

It may be that the reader reads too much into *The Last Enchantments* and thus makes the story seem to be worth more than it actually is. The plot is very simple. Andrew and Stephen are young brothers who live together in a suburb of Christminster (Oxford). They come to know their neighbor, Mrs. Foyle, who has supported her widowhood and put her daughter through college by running a boardinghouse. Mrs. Foyle is a pathetic creature even in her courage. She has neither fingers nor toes and no hair. Her tea parties are conducted in a dim religious light, and to them come the odd people of the university town. While she is not quite top drawer socially, she does possess a gentility which puts her socially above those who run boardinghouses for students and others who are on the periphery of the town's society. Her daughter, Miranda, has married Sir Peter Elliott, the leading Shakespearean actor of the country. Miranda scorns her mother; while the mother, who has sacrificed herself for her child, constantly defends her snobbery and cruelty.

Andrew, who tells the story, is aloof and remote from the troubles of his odd, intellectual neighbors. Stephen and he live in an ivory tower. Yet they are compassionate in spite of themselves. Before the war, they identify themselves with Quaker groups who hope to avert the catastrophe, although eventually they are drawn into it; and the last chapter of the book, in moving language, brings the book to a climax in Stephen's death.

But it seemed to me that this simple story was a symbol of our times

and history. Mrs. Foyle is humanity, maimed but courageous, which makes its sad sacrifices for an ungrateful generation which follows. These gentle but pathetic people lived shadowy and unreal lives in "the last enchantments of the middle age." They saw the bitterness of the world and sought to remain aloof. They had wit and sensibility. Their compassionate neighborliness was crushed into tragedy by forces beyond them. Their gentle land is gone. Andrew cries, "Oh, beloved city, to which my heart is tied by a thousand nerve-strings, and all of them twisted with pain." The book's style is charming and witty and perceptive. One is sad to realize that such a world has gone from us.

The Crack in the Column is an excellent novel about the contemporary political situation in Greece, revealing not only penetrating comprehension of the lethal struggle going on in our world, but also a description of the grave consequences of human action.

Michael Walker is a British agent who directs a cell of resistance against the occupying Germans. MacPhail is an American fortress pilot who is shot down over Greece and joins the underground. But to try to unravel the tangled political skeins of Greek political allegiance and to determine which is the "right" side is beyond the American's comprehension. He meets the Communist leader, General Ares, the leader of ELAS, which is the army of the popular front EAM. Ares, charming and evil and crafty, tries to convince him that the rightist Zervas is a German collaborator, who in working for the return of King George "will kill Greek democracy." So the Americans, because they are confused, remain neutral as the British are surrounded by the Communists. The Americans eventually replace the British as the true power in Greece, not because their policy is clearer but because they have more money. "The great disorderly thud of the American heart could be heard, eager to be tapped for everybody and everything, everywhere, more like an udder than a heart, indiscriminate and cowlike, asking only that it would like to be loved."

The theme of the book is that of political division, when people are driven either to the right or the left and can seemingly find no resolution for a tragic dilemma. The American MacPhail could not understand the Greeks, who seemed to be determined only to slaughter one another. The plot of the book is as confusing as the many political divisions it describes and in places is hard to follow. But the descriptions of episodes are graphic and the effect of the book ominous as it portrays the deep cleft which splits our world apart.

Henry Green is the nom de plume of a British industrialist whose novels have borne such terse titles as *Living*, *Caught*, *Blindness*. Now *Loving* is published in this country. His style is clear, charming, and direct. This story leads one again to look for more profound symbolic meanings hidden within a not significant but bright tale. An Irish castle houses two communities, neither of which understands the other. Mrs. Tennant and her daughter-in-law, with her two children, live above stairs. Below stairs is a hierarchy of servants whose ruler is Raunce, who has just been promoted from head footman to butler. His perquisites are many. He carves the meat at meals for the staff, rules the perverse housekeeper and the brutish cook, is adored by the housemaids and scullery people, and picks up odds and ends of graft in the purchase of food and in the possibility of blackmail on one of his employers. The plot is not elaborate. There is a lost ring and a discovered scandal. The staff have their petty quarrels and jealousies. It's hard to tell whether the author likes these people. While he writes about them with a gentle irony, he also seems to enjoy their frail humanity. All of these servants are English. They are protected against the war by being in Ireland. But in the end, Raunce and Edith, in love with one another in their odd way, go back to England to join the war effort and take the consequences of the nation's jeopardy.

This is more than the story of the dissolution of the great houses. The castle is an enchanted place where these people with their mean little parasitic lives are protected. It isn't as though their experience were unreal: rather it lacks the element of courage and sacrifice. Even for people who are protected in their triviality, such existence palls. The story moves along easily and effortlessly. Like the life it describes, it seems inconsequential. But beyond it is demand which makes its appeal even to the Raunces of this world; and finally they respond.

There are two historical novels which people seem to be enjoying. *Morning Time* tells the story of that misty but decisive period in our history when the colonies had won their independence but had not yet framed a constitution. The Congress is powerless. The nation has no executive. The land is riven by sectional rivalries. Customs barriers and different laws separate the colonies from one another. War lords like Ethan Allen or General Wilkinson or Sevier threaten to establish separate realms. Merchants hope to set up a ruling oligarchy. Land companies take land, won by the pioneers through "tomahawk rights" from their owners.

All of these discordant cries drown the song of unity. It looks as though a Babel would emerge in place of a commonwealth. This chaos

is des
nectic
keeps
chaos,
ideali

A rag
Castle
Dizzy
with
toria
Mudl
style.
clever
termin

Mary.
P

The L
C

The C
P

Lovin

Morni

3

The M

P

is described around the adventures of Theron Hawley, a lad from Connecticut who had fought through the Revolution. It's a good yarn which keeps the reader entertained, while he wonders that from such political chaos, sensible heads could finally work out a people united in hope and idealism.

The Mudlark is a very pleasant tale about Victoria and Disraeli. A ragged little urchin from London's East End works his way into Windsor Castle and almost causes a political crisis. This odd pair, Victoria and Dizzy, together rule the world. The shrewd, foppish, sensuous Disraeli, with his obvious blandishments, twists the practical and sentimental Victoria around his little finger. Dizzy's speech to Parliament about the Mudlark is a classic. The story moves with a gentle pace and a graceful style. The fortunes of empire are affected by little human foibles. A clever man and a selfish, shrewd, and, at times, rather timid woman determine the fate of millions. *The Mudlark* shows how human it all can be.

Mary. By SHOLEM ASCH. Translated by Leo Steinberg. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. pp. 436. \$3.50.

The Last Enchantments. By ROBERT LIDDELL. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts. pp. 273. \$2.75.

The Crack in the Column. By GEORGE WELLER. New York: Random House. pp. 370. \$3.00.

Loving. By HENRY GREEN. New York: The Viking Press. pp. 248. \$3.00.

Morning Time. By CHARLES O'NEILL. New York: Simon and Schuster. pp. 393. \$2.95.

The Mudlark. By THEODORE BONNET. New York: Doubleday and Company. pp. 305. \$3.00.

Book Reviews

The Story of American Protestantism. By ANDREW LANDALE DRUMMOND. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1949. pp. xii-418. 30s.

Dr. Drummond, a Scot, has added an excellent volume to our all too short list of comprehensive histories of the Christianity of the United States. He has limited himself to Protestantism, but American Protestantism has been the chief religious factor in molding the ideals of the United States, and its richness and wide variety entitle it to the sizable volume which he has given it. While Dr. Drummond has done most of his writing in his native land, he has been a resident of the United States, holds an American degree, and so knows at first-hand the subject with which he deals. Yet it is as a Scot that Dr. Drummond addresses himself to his task, and it is the British public which he has primarily in mind. However, this very approach gives added value for the American reader, because it brings with it a perspective which is most welcome. One recalls that two of the most discerning descriptions of the United States were written by friendly visitors, Count de Tocqueville and Lord Bryce. Unlike these predecessors, Dr. Drummond has not attempted, except incidentally, an appraisal, or a description of the contemporary scene, but has confined himself chiefly to narrative. In his narrative, however, he has, almost inevitably, if by nothing more than the proportion which he has accorded to various sections of his story, presented something of an estimate of American Protestantism.

The volume begins, as is proper, with the earliest English settlements. It devotes between a third and a fourth of its pages to the colonial period. Nearly the same amount of space is assigned to the period since the Civil War. The style is readable, at times sprightly, and the narrative is lightened by many anecdotes. Yet numerous details are included and the book can be used for reference as well as for an inclusive survey. The author has availed himself of a fairly extensive bibliography, some of it consisting of original sources and some, as is proper in a work of this scope, of the better secondary accounts. No attempt has been made to bolster the text with detailed footnote citations of authorities, but occasional references are given, always usefully.

The captious reviewer can discover what he believes to be mistakes of fact. While wide-ranging in his vision and his journeys, Coke did not (p. 150) "found mission stations all over the world." Whitefield made an undoubtedly significant contribution to the Great Awakening, but his share was not as large as would be inferred from the preface (p. viii), for the movement was primarily indigenous and had already been under way for some years when he arrived. It is not quite correct to say (p. 284) that Samuel J. Mills founded the American Bible Society. He had a large share in bringing it into existence, but its creation was the work of several hands. Dr. Drummond comes out plumply for the traditional story (p. 272) that Whitman's famous winter ride from the Pacific Northwest to the East was inspired by the desire to save the Oregon Country for the United States. This is a myth which has long been exploded.

More serious are some of the omissions and near-omissions. It is hard to understand how a history of American Protestantism could be written with only passing mention of Dr. John R. Mott, of the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, of the Sunday-school movement, and of the various young

people's organizations. Opinions will honestly differ as to what constitutes an accurate sense of proportion, but it is difficult to justify the scant attention to the denominations which most affect the religious life of the majority of the older American stock—the Baptists, the Methodists, and the Disciples of Christ—and the emphasis upon those churches, notably the Episcopalians, the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, and the Unitarians, which serve chiefly the minority who compose the upper-income groups. The author also writes with a distinct preference for liberals.

After all the strictures have been voiced—and others might be assembled—the fact remains that Dr. Drummond has given us one of the few good historical surveys of American Protestantism.

KENNETH S. LATOURETTE

Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Religion, Yale University,
New Haven, Connecticut.

Note: This book is available in the United States from Blessing Book Stores, Inc., 81 W. Van Buren Street, Chicago 5, Illinois.

In Our Image: Character Studies from the Old Testament. By HOUSTON HARTE and GUY ROWE. New York: The Oxford University Press, 1949. pp. xv-197. \$10.

The text is selected from the King James Version of the Bible by Houston Harte, important newspaper publisher in San Antonio, Texas, with the approval of seven noted clergymen. The thirty-two full-colored illustrations are by Guy Rowe, best known by his portraits on the covers of *Time* magazine.

The pictures are revolutionary as Bible illustrations. They are not just storytellers, like the popular Coppings, Holes, and Hofmanns; they are psychological studies. They take you deep into the mind and heart of man. That is, no doubt, the reason for the unusual title: the artist is picturing you and me. Through the eyes of these people we can see our own souls as in a radiograph. Not all readers will like these pictures. They arouse more emotion than the average person can stand. That is no fault of the pictures; rather it is the limitation of people who are not used to the provocations of realistic portraiture. But everyone will surely develop enthusiasm for some of them.

Two of the artist's most effective devices for revealing mental and emotional states are his drawing of mouths and eyes, and the lines on the faces. Most of the faces are furrowed. They look like contour plowing on a hillside farm. All past experience of these individuals, as well as their current states of mind, are revealed in this "charactery" of their brows, as Shakespeare called it—what the graving tool of experience has left as an ineradicable design.

May I suggest the proper method of looking at these portraits?

Put yourself inside the painted face and imitate it. In a brief time you will know what it feels like to be a Noah, a Joshua, a Job, in his particular situation. Let us try it out with a few of the best portraits. That will help us understand the artist and greatly admire his genius.

VII. *Joseph and His Brethren.* The background is filled with the ten older brothers. Every undisciplined face is alive, each with its own passion: suspicion, disdain, plotting, obstreperous yelling aimed at frightening the boy into abandoning his conceit and his telltale habits. But Joseph, in his coat of many colors, is not

in the slightest frightened. He is a modern adolescent with deep, clear-seeing eyes that show he still believes in the dream of the bowing sheaves and the adoring stars. Surely none other of these sons of Jacob could ever become the vizier of an empire!

XV. *Ruth and Naomi*. Naomi has the wrinkles of age, but the eyes, mouth, and pointed nose of a strong-willed, kindly woman, with an intelligence that can solve problems. Ruth's lustrous blue eyes survey a distant future: though the new life may have its uncertainties, yet youth and love are eager to face them.

XX. *David Mourns*. This is the climax of grief and despair over the death of Absalom. Study the lines: on the nose from the tip to the center of the forehead; around the eyes, where they focus with such intensity and form a bank that keeps the tears from falling. Feel the grief in the closed but tremulous mouth, in the hands clutching one another with ineffective tension. And behind, note the crafty Joab, who killed the son but now is checking off the political moves the mourner must immediately make.

XXV. *Job*. Again a study in contour lines. Turn the picture upside down and its lines and masses will revolt you. Job is the central figure, as indicated by his boils. The friend on the right has flabby ridges on cheeks and forehead; his eyes and mouth show the despair Job himself expressed in Chapter 3. The friend at the top is haughtily contemptuous: his hand indicates that he wants to speak next (Zophar—11:2-6a). The friend on the left seems to be alarmed at Job's daring (Eliphaz—15:2-8). Job's heavily lined face is an enigma. The eyes, though tearful, are not surrendering; and the mouth is telling God he has made a mistake thus to afflict a righteous man (see the "Code of a Gentleman" in Job 31). As Dr. Pfeiffer puts it, in his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 688, Job is "a titanic challenger of the deity, passing from moods of abject despondency and hopeless pessimism to flaming indignation bordering occasionally on hysterical frenzy." (Doubtless many readers, including the artist, will challenge this interpretation.)

XXX. *Nebuchadnezzar's Dream* (Daniel 4). The dream is a huge dismantled tree in the background. The fat old demented king with his bird's-claw nails looks with suspicious eyes and mouth at the prophet. But Daniel is really concerned with the king and with the future of the world. His brows and eyes are tense with the voltage of the revelation that has come to him; his mouth utters the oracle, his right hand points to heaven. The whole design pictures the world's rejection of a prophet's apocalyptic visions, but the utter conviction of the prophet.

Other revealing and emotionally strong portraits are found in III, IV, V, XVII, XIX, XXVI. In XXII, *Solomon Judging*, the king is too old to fit a story located at the beginning of his reign (I Kings 3:16-28) when he was only nineteen.

ALBERT EDWARD BAILEY

21 Saxon Road, Worcester, Massachusetts.

The Prophetic Faith. By MARTIN BUBER. Translated from the Hebrew by Carlyle Witton-Davies. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949. pp. 247. \$3.75.

Dr. Buber, who is Professor of Religious Philosophy at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, has put into this compact volume the significant results of a lifetime of devout biblical scholarship and critical study. The book is thought-provoking and stimulating, promising richly to reward those who give it the careful reading it deserves.

Accepting (with certain modifications) the position of Alt in his *Der Gott der Väter*, that the founders of the Hebrew nation were not only actual individuals but the recipients of special revelations long before the time of Moses, Buber shows how the prophetic faith originated in the experience of these "fathers" to whom God appeared under the names El, El Shaddai, or the ejaculation "Yahu," meaning "O that One!" Thus God manifested himself to an individual or to a family. Then came the revelation to a people through the theophany at the sacred mountain, whereby this God became the God of Israel. After the entrance of this people into Canaan, the covenant with Yahweh was confirmed at the Shechem assembly (Joshua 24) and during the conquest it was gloriously dramatized by the victory of Israel under Deborah over the Canaanites. The deity who brings this to pass is not a new God—he is the God of the fathers.

The prophets are thus the inheritors, not the originators, of a faith. Through the cultural, social, and religious tensions of their day the prophets found the opportunity and the incentive for formulating and clarifying the meaning of God for their contemporaries. These tensions were in part created by economic and political forces, and in part by those of a psychological and spiritual nature. International rivalries between Egypt and Assyria, or her successor Babylonia, the domestic struggle between the economic philosophies of the merchant-farmer and the nomad, symbolized by baalism and Yahwism respectively, and the personal conflict within the soul of man between his own will and the righteous purposes of God, constituted the ever-present tensions which could not be resolved save by acceptance of the redemptive God of prophetic religion. To insure this acceptance the prophets, each in his own way, proclaimed their faith: Amos by an appeal to righteousness, Hosea to lovingkindness, Jeremiah to inward spirituality, and still others to the divine meaning of suffering.

Not all readers will accept Dr. Buber's view of the faith of the fathers, the historical reliability of the early patriarchal narratives, or his rejection of the Kenite hypothesis. This scholar's dating of sections of the Pentateuch may be open to criticism also. For example, he places Exodus 20 before chapter 34. However, it should be said that the "orthodox" treatment of the sources of the Pentateuch is at present under attack and that Buber does not stand alone in this matter. He also maintains the essential unity of the Book of Amos, the doxologies and the conclusion being viewed as authentic. An attempt is made to show how the hopeful passages in the prophets are religiously complementary to the sections on judgment and should not be deleted.

But these are relatively unimportant criticisms when seen in the light of the insights and important contributions exhibited in this volume. Among these are the emphasis upon the value of tradition to the careful historian, since tradition records, if not actual external events, a real relationship between the believer and the object of his faith. The biblical evidence of such a relationship is just as factual as the account of the event occurring in time and space. This is an exceedingly important distinction for the student of the Bible. *A second noteworthy contribution is the description of the group prophets as promoters of tradition and religious living, not by the method of mouthing incoherent sounds and acting like madmen—the usual view—but by the "enthusiastic singing of monotonous songs" conveying meaning to the listener and to the prophet.

The maturity of the writer's spirit and scholarship is evident in many parts of the book. Wide reading, patient research, and persistent reflection upon the

problems of biblical study are here revealed. Nowhere is this more apparent than in a striking sentence which disposes of the futile debate as to the "monotheism" of Amos: "all the pretension of such distinctions (as to the various 'isms') comes to nothing when it tries to assert itself in the face of what is to be found here: a man, given up to the oneness of his God."

OTTO J. BAAB

Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois.

The Theology of the Old Testament. By OTTO J. BAAB. New York: The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949. pp. 287. \$3.50.

Two trends in Old Testament scholarship today call for fresh appraisal in the interest of biblical theology. One is the application of the critical method which appears to be content with a fragmentary study of the literature and so provides no frame for the unitary presentation of the religious ideas contained therein, while the other employs the philosophic principle of development in the interest of unity. The first stresses such matters as dates, authorship, documentary analysis, scribal interpolations, and editorial revision, all of which are important for critical investigation of sources. The second seeks to reduce the conclusions of critical investigation to a chronological frame within which the development of religious ideas is traced, often after the pattern of "unilinear evolution." Professor Baab, of Garrett Biblical Institute, recognizes the inadequacy of both approaches. He subordinates the first to the background of his study, and practically rejects the second. Therein lies both the strength and the weakness of his book.

The material is well organized in nine chapters. The first and the last deal with general questions of methods of study and criteria of validation of Old Testament theology. The other seven are devoted to a study of the doctrine of God, man, sin, salvation, the Kingdom of God, death and the future life, and the problem of evil. Without attempting to show a development from lower to higher levels of religious thought—such as from polytheism through henotheism to monotheism—the author seeks to discover and set forth the central concepts of the religion of Israel as they are contained in the Old Testament. Each of these "living truths" is studied in relation to the others that are discovered within the literature. Thus "an understanding of the idea of God becomes the clue to knowledge on such matters as sin and salvation." In nearly every case also the doctrine is presented first in terms of the group and then in the light of the stress upon the individual that appeared in some of the writings of the period of the Exile and after. So man is treated as a corporate personality representing the group. In Psalm 51 "the first-person pronoun can be interpreted to mean the religious community, and not a particular person writing as an individual." Yet in discussing sin as personal, Professor Baab cites Psalm 51 as an expression of consciousness of sin in which "the psalmist admits his guilt and his sin, calling upon God to cleanse him thoroughly" . . . stating that "he has sinned against God only." Basic in the treatment of both the doctrine of man and of sin is the conception of man as created in the image of God. This accounts for man's freedom, moral worth, and the possibility of sin and redemption. Incidentally, Professor Baab thinks that the Old Testament analysis of man is closer to recent functional psychology than to the earlier faculty psychology.

Salvation is both a national deliverance and a personal experience, primarily

the former. The Kingdom of God, one of the most important of all the Old Testament doctrines, must be studied in the light of Israel's history. Indeed it is the clue to the Old Testament view of the meaning of history. Out of the conviction that Israel's hope of redemption is rooted in the character and purpose of God, many of the Old Testament writers went on to say that victory over sin and death, indeed the final solution of the problem of evil, must come by man's response to divine revelation in terms of repentance, trust, obedience, prayer, and worship.

In all of his work here the author combines clarity and accuracy of thought in word study with comprehensiveness in surveying the sweep of history. He has given us a good introductory guide to Old Testament theology. It merits careful study on the part of ministers as well as students and teachers, and such study will yield a rich reward. My only serious criticism concerns the treatment of the principle of development. It should not be rejected because of its affinity with Hegelian philosophy. There is a development—a progressive revelation—inherent in the religious experiences and reflections recorded in the Old Testament, a fact that is recognized at points in the book but without adequate examination. This lack leads to a somewhat disjointed treatment of the Old Testament in the general frame of biblical theology. For example, in criticizing neo-orthodoxy the author says, "Karl Barth may adequately and accurately interpret Paul, but he definitely ignores or distorts the teaching of the Old Testament on this matter of the divine sovereignty and human freedom" (p. 263). Where does this leave Paul in relation to the Old Testament? If there is a conflict the implication is that the Old Testament view has superior validity to the New. Indeed, this is rather positively suggested on the same page in this summary statement: "This brief discussion of the validity of Israel's idea of God makes it clear that this is a conception of unsurpassed value and of immeasurable importance for contemporary religion and life." One wonders where this leaves the principle of fulfillment that unites the two Testaments in one Bible.

Yet this is a book of superior worth. It will serve well as a text for class work in college or seminary. And it will stimulate expository preaching. It is to be hoped that it will have wide and sustained use, and that it will lead to the writing of more books in this rich field, especially by Professor Baab.

HAROLD W. TRIBBLE

President, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts.

The Rise of Christianity. By ERNEST WILLIAM BARNES. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Fifth impression, 1948. pp. xx-356. 15s.

This book, by the Bishop of Birmingham, is unusual among others on its subject in its free discarding of traditional viewpoints, and not less so in the simplicity and directness of its style, which is well adapted to give it a wide public. American readers familiar with the books of the late Dr. Shirley Jackson Case will find here a trend of interpretation similar to his; but the bishop writes without footnotes, and for the general reader, and the range of his scholarship is left somewhat in doubt.

Like old-time historians he begins with a survey of the history of antiquity on its religious side, but, unlike them, his object in this is to represent Christianity as springing naturally from a world of ideas that had arisen before it. Chapters

on "The Mystery Religions" and on "Miracles" lead us to "The Birth and Origin of Jesus." Far from attempting to harmonize the Gospel narratives, Bishop Barnes emphasizes their discrepancies and errors. Matthew and Luke differ widely in their accounts of the Nativity, but, as a result of a mistranslation of Isaiah 7:14, both have the virgin birth; while in Mark's earlier account "Mary seems throughout unconscious of her son's divine origin and destiny." The Gospel miracles are not different in character from those familiar in the literature of antiquity, and must be judged in the same way.

In his study of Jesus' teaching, our author stresses his use of "ludicrous exaggeration," and relates the passages on the camel with others that have too solemnly been taken in a literal sense. Yet we are, at times, made to feel that Jesus is quite central to the bishop's religion, and there seems in him the suggestion of a commitment to the utterly God-conscious Jesus such as Schweitzer combines with drastic criticism of the Gospels.

The early disciples, he says, felt a certainty that Jesus was alive and present with them, and they clothed this belief in the form of the resurrection stories. Paul may have been married, as one dubious letter of Ignatius states. The First Letter of Clement, which Barnes would date about A.D. 125, is the earliest evidence favorable to the martyrdom of Peter and Paul in or near Rome; real proof that Peter ever was in Rome is lacking. Paul, whose father could not have been a full citizen of Tarsus without worship of the city gods, apparently revolted from his boyhood paganism after becoming familiar with the mystery cults, to orthodox Judaism. The canon of Paul's letters properly includes neither the Pastoral Epistles nor Ephesians, and parts of I Corinthians are interpolated. On this basis, a somewhat ample examination of the apostle's thought is presented. This is followed by a review, with attention to dates, of the early second-century Christian writings.

There are chapters on "Baptism" and "The Eucharist." Nothing in the book is more negative than the treatment of the Last Supper. A striking aspect of the argument regarding the upgrowth of the sacrament of the Eucharist is the refusal to regard I Corinthians 10 and 11 as Pauline. In later chapters, Dr. Barnes regards early Christianity as "socialist, pacifist, and internationalist," and hence accounts for its unpopularity and persecution.

The book is penetrating and full of brilliant conjectures—most of which have appeared before. It is also marked by judgments that appear to be subjective and to rest upon no adequate basis of fact. I quote two sentences—the first from the chapter on Passion Week: "By every law of probability Christianity ought to have perished. That it survived is—do we exaggerate?—the supreme miracle of history." The other is from the preface: "Complaint has been made that readers can hardly find in the book such words as Trinity, Incarnation, and supernatural. None of these words occur in the New Testament, and they belong to theology rather than to history."

It is legitimate to complain that the book does little or nothing to make explicable "the supreme miracle of history"; that it employs a great many conceptions which, like the missing ones just mentioned, do not occur in the New Testament; and that the church's theology is a part of its history.

JOHN T. MCNEILL

Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Man from Nazareth: as his Contemporaries Saw Him. By HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. pp. 282. \$3.00.

Though in recent years there has been a marked trend throughout the Christian world away from "the Jesus of history" toward "the Christ of faith" and a high Christology, nevertheless vital books on the Jesus of history continue to appear. Of these, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick's *The Man from Nazareth* will deservedly become one of the most widely used.

In view of the impossibility of knowing the self-consciousness of Jesus directly, Dr. Fosdick approaches the subject indirectly, by studying the reaction of various groups to Jesus. The reader is shown what, in the teaching and personality of Jesus, caused some to be drawn to him, as were the crowds, the religious and moral outcasts, the women and children, his first disciples, and "Jews with a world-wide outlook"; and caused others to be antagonized by him, as were the scribes and Pharisees, the self-complacent, and the militant nationalists. Not only is there abundant material in the Gospels for such a study, but much can be learned about the different groups from sources outside the New Testament. There is an epilogue showing that Jesus was not only a man of his time, but also a man of all times, and indicating why his teaching has universal validity. Each chapter is thoroughly documented, and there is a well-selected bibliography.

The general position of the book might be called that of moderate liberalism. Though shown to be a "reformer," Jesus is not modernized into one attacking "social problems" in our present-day sense, nor expecting evolutionary progress toward the kingdom of God. "He shared the hope that was real to his people's tradition—a divine intervention in history that would bring the Kingdom in." On the other hand, apocalypticism is not treated as the controlling motive in Jesus' thought, nor is any special form of eschatology felt to be needed to explain his ideas. Jesus' teaching was not an "interim ethic," nor was it "perfectionist" in any sense removing it from practical application to this tough world. It was under the terrific tension of his own living that he himself won through to the basic insights that he shared with others.

Dr. Fosdick modestly disclaims being a New Testament specialist, but he is abreast of recent developments in New Testament study, and makes effective use of rabbinical studies, source criticism, and a very mild type of form criticism in order to go not only back to the sources, but back of the sources. He has the rare gift of making the results of technical study intelligible to the general reader. The book is, therefore, scholarly without being technical, and popular without being superficial. It would have a readier appeal without the first chapter defending the thesis that Jesus is "a real man, not a myth." Dr. Fosdick himself shows that the proponents of the mythological theory "have left no disciples of any importance in the field of scholarship," while it seems improbable that "the ordinary reader" for whom he is writing would ever have doubted Jesus' being "a real man." It would have been more timely to focus the material upon the question posed by the form critics as to how much we can dependably know about the life and teaching of the Jesus whom all admit to have really lived.

The book comes alive in Chapter II and stays alive to the end. Chapters III to V illuminate, from different angles, Jesus' conflict with the legalists, and some of the freshest insights for the general reader will be found here. Most enlightening of all, as compared with the material usually included in popular books on Jesus, is Chapter IX, which demonstrates that among those who came in contact with

Jesus there would inevitably have been many "Jews with a world-wide outlook," and that certain of the universal elements in Jesus' recorded teaching reveal neither the church's later creativeness nor Jesus' conflict with all Judaism, but rather his sympathy with a form of liberal Judaism which existed then as verifiably as the legalism and narrowness that he attacked.

MARION BENEDICT ROLLINS

Professor of Religion, Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Virginia.

Recovery of Man. By F. R. BARRY, Bishop of Southwell. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1949. pp. viii-109. \$2.00.

There have been enough clever foolish books written to confuse the minds of men. There have been enough brilliant bad books written to corrupt human intelligence. There have been enough wise and good books written to guide men in the ways of clear and noble thought and of wise and fruitful action. The circulation of the wise and good books is of primary importance for the survival of civilization itself.

Bishop Barry's book, *Recovery of Man*, belongs to the class of books which deserve the widest possible reading. In the midst of a clutter of books of psychopathic brilliancy, the clear sanity of Dr. Barry's thinking gives one an experience like that of coming to solid ground from a miasmic swamp. "Too much contemporary theology and too much religious apologetic reveal an antihumanistic tendency which is, in my judgment, incompatible with the genius of Christianity," he declares, and he states in downright fashion: "Christianity is the real Humanism." "The New Testament," he asserts, "is the charter of man's dignity." "The great task of the church in this savage era is the rehabilitation of Humanism." Of course, by Humanism Dr. Barry does not mean the theory of the absent God and the self-sufficient man. Nor does he mean the theory of the nonexistent God and the man who can get along very well by using his own resources. He means the man made in the image of God who can only come to his own in a God-centered life. The more we know about man, the more we come to understand that he cannot get along without God.

God has revealed himself to men. "Nor if we accept this revelation can we regard his reason as so corrupted as to be wholly unreliable." "The attempt made by some Christian theologians, both in medieval and modern times, to throw doubt on the validity of reason as an instrument by which we can know God, undermines the whole basis of theology."

Bishop Barry declares most emphatically that we must take our stand against the whole depersonalizing tendency of modern thought. "We must break away from the outworn dogmas of a rationalist and mechanistic tradition, and advance toward a 'personalist' world-view, which can by right claim primacy for persons because a personal God is the center of it."

Bishop Barry does not treat lightly the moral tragedy of human life, and he is much concerned to find the true Christian basis for social action. "In truth it is only when we face relentlessly the unmitigated horrors of sin and death that we can see the full glory of the Gospel or become awake to the wonder of God's gifts—Forgiveness and Resurrection unto life." "There is no situation which cannot be redeemed by the mercy and grace of God."

The man who has mastered the positions of this book, and has made them his own, will discover that he has a glad and potent and a really Christian message

to give to hard-pressed men and women. He will not find himself caught in the coils of a decadent theology whose dark pessimism leaves no sound basis for the proclaiming of a message which, by any stretch of the imagination, could be called a gospel. There is something savagely ironic about sending men forth to conduct an evangelistic advance who have ceased to have any glad tidings to tell to men.

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

Dean Emeritus of Drew Theological Seminary. New York City.

No Coward Soul. By DAVID A. MACLENNAN. New York: The Oxford University Press, 1949. pp. ix-244. \$3.00.

Dr. David A. MacLennan, the author of this book of excellent sermons, has been for many years pastor of the Timothy Eaton Memorial Church, Toronto, Canada. He has recently been called to the Chair of Homiletics at Yale Divinity School. It is gratifying to think that students for the Christian ministry will have the benefit of the instruction and guidance which he is so well qualified to give in the field of homiletics.

It is sometimes said of a man that he is a "born preacher." This designation certainly befits the author of these sermons. By any test these are sermons of a man who knows how to preach. They are rich in content, lucid in style, and marked by many penetrating and arresting insights. For example, in his sermon "When the Wind Is Against Us," he comments on the text, "He cometh unto them walking upon the sea but would have passed them," as follows: "That puzzles us, and more than one modern translator prefers to say that the Master was coming to join them, but Christ never compelled anyone to take him on board. He never demands a place on the ship. Although always he draws near the soul in distress, unless there is recognition and welcome, he passes by. 'If any man will open the door, I will come in'; not otherwise." (p. 16) This is typical of the insights with which the book is replete.

The sermons are in no sense labored. Although the author draws freely from many fields—history, philosophy, psychology—yet nothing is dragged in. It all seems to belong. Moreover, the sermons possess vitality. Some sermons give one the feeling that they are put together mechanically; they hold together but in a sort of wooden way. These are more like an organism; they seem to grow, there is life and vitality in them.

In his preface the author says "the chapters are variations on a single theme: how God through Jesus Christ provides resources for effective living in this critical and creative 'age between the ages.'" (p. 7) He accomplishes his purpose. The sermons are written not so much to convince the skeptic as to strengthen the believer, and that after all may be the best way to convince the skeptic.

The subjects are varied. They deal for the most part with individual problems, though the author does not altogether ignore the social issues of our age. They are helpful sermons on family life and on the problems of war and peace. Dr. MacLennan's subjects are interesting and arresting without being sensational: "Good Grief"; "Wait Awhile"; "Too Bad to Be True"; "Surprise!" The author invariably begins where people live. The sermon "Does God Care?" begins, "You wait by the information desk of a hospital one day, and a man and woman pass by. They carry an invisible burden of grief." Thus one's interest and attention are caught at the outset.

It has been said that each minister has but one sermon which he preaches

in a hundred different ways. Dr. MacLennan's sermon is that the gospel of Christ, the redeeming, healing, life-giving gospel, is adequate for all human need. He preaches that in many ways. No minister or layman will read this book without finding illumination and helpful guidance. It breathes the air of courage and high faith.

HAROLD C. PHILLIPS

First Baptist Church, Cleveland, Ohio.

The Religious Revolt Against Reason. By L. HAROLD DEWOLF. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. pp. 217. \$2.50.

We have heard repeatedly from theologians in our time of the helplessness and hopelessness of man's reason as an instrument for validating religious beliefs. But it is encouraging to note the number of recent studies which will not allow the "revolt against reason" to go unchallenged. Hegel may be dead, but the dialectic of which he spoke over a century ago is very much alive. And this volume by DeWolf is one more concrete evidence of the validity of that movement in theology today (one which seems to be gaining momentum) which insists upon the essential reasonableness of Christianity.

From start to finish the author has shown a concern for the reader that is somewhat unusual in a theologian. He has made the outline and development of his book perfectly clear. His style, though plain and simple (perhaps because of these qualities), is admirably suited to convey his thoughts. Now and then he puts in phrases and sentences which for their directness, charm, or cogency deserve special mention. And he does all this without cheapening the work from the standpoint of scholarship.

What has DeWolf accomplished here? What service has he rendered? He has told us who the revolters against reason are and the charges they have made. Kierkegaard is the central figure in the modern revolt. Barth, Brunner, Reinhold Niebuhr, and others have, in varying degrees, gone down the same road. So DeWolf makes these men the spokesmen against reason. He states their arguments for disavowing reason as a safe guide in matters of religious belief. And he does this so well that I regard this portion of the book (Chapter II) as containing the finest summary of the charges against reason that I have seen!

The defense of reason begins in Chapter III. The author takes up, point by point, the arguments mentioned in the preceding chapter and indicates wherein he considers them in error. Among other things, he points out that: (1) reason does not wage war against personal commitment and trust; (2) it is not reason, but the absence of it, that tends to make men presumptuous; and (3) reason, far from excluding knowledge of God by living encounters, leads us to assert it. From here the fight is carried on in the form of a direct frontal attack against irrationalism (Chapter IV). And again we find some unusually penetrating remarks. The author insists, to mention just one, that we require a great deal of rational knowledge of God even to affirm that he is beyond reason (pp. 144-145). The final chapter treats of reason and faith in such a manner as to assert their interdependence. All in all, I regard this as one of the most convincing contributions to theology in recent years. But, of course, on all important subjects, much is yet to be said.

MACK B. STOKES

Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Georgia.

F. H. Bradley. By W. F. LOFTHOUSE. London: Philosopher's Library, Epworth Press, 1949. pp. viii-273. 10s. 6d.

W. F. Lofthouse has written a sympathetic, lucid, and exceedingly readable critique of the writings of Francis Herbert Bradley, the English neo-Hegelian. Those acquainted with the difficulties of Bradley's philosophy will know how to appreciate the clarity of Mr. Lofthouse's presentation. This is still true when one recognizes that the author has skirted around or touched lightly many of the technical issues of Bradley's thought. For Lofthouse's main interest is in understanding the significance of Bradley's life and thought from the point of view of a Christian philosophy. He makes this special interest explicit from the outset, and manages to consider the chief writings of his admired champion with what this reviewer believes to be commendable objectivity.

Somewhat less successful is the attempt to treat Bradley's life and the Oxford background of his thought. Hegel once wrote that some men have a life and no opinions, others opinions and no life, while only the few have both life and opinions. Bradley would appear to fit into the second of these categories, for he seems to have had precious little biography worth recording.

Mr. Lofthouse is aware of the comparative eclipse of this idealistic school of thought in the contemporary scene, and the neglect of Bradley's contribution in particular. A generation or two ago so many thoughtful people in England and America believed that Bradley, Bosanquet, Green, and others offered the chance of a genuine reconciliation between essential Christian truth and the claims of natural science. This mode of thinking was the way out for those who found the Christian *Weltanschauung* emotionally compelling and persuasive, and at the same time recognized the relevance of scientific explanations of nature. With Hegel and the German Romanticists, philosophy had seemed to turn away from its long preoccupation with mathematical physical science and to come to the defense of human values and religious truths. Though at the cost of sacrificing much traditional dogma and literalist terminology, these philosophical Romanticists did seem to save the essentials of a Christian philosophy. But today the appeal of this apparent reconciliation has largely vanished.

Though Mr. Lofthouse tries valiantly to maintain the thesis that Bradley's thought is not contrary to Christian principles and, if carried further by Bradley, would have served to bolster orthodox Christianity, he has not convinced this reader. It is not at all certain that he has really convinced himself. For the author is an honest thinker and, it appears, is very deeply committed to basic Christian principles. When it becomes a question of choosing either a favorite Bradleyan idea or a Christian dogma such as God's creativity or redemptive power, Lofthouse unhesitatingly chooses the latter. In the final chapters of the book, Lofthouse's views of Christian theology are made explicit, and here it becomes evident, almost painfully so in view of the author's thesis, how far Bradley is from the truth of faith.

Bradley's view of the Absolute, as inclusive of all that is, cannot be substituted for the Christian God. For this Absolute as the sole Reality is too separate from the realm of appearance, is inactive, unchanging, eternal, more remote than Aristotle's Unmoved Mover. To be sure, Bradley recognized a God apart from the Absolute and was, almost alone among the idealists, insistent on the separateness of religion and philosophy. Mr. Lofthouse is inclined to make much of this fact.

Yet Bradley's God is disconcertingly placed in the realm of appearance and subordinated in all important respects to the unresponsive Absolute. After examining the Bradleyan God, Mr. Lofthouse concludes that the Absolute can more nearly qualify for the position of the Christian God. Only Bradley did not go far enough. Bradley's Absolute implies the Christian conception of God, Mr. Lofthouse writes, but "he stopped at the very point where consistency with his own argument would have bidden him advance. It would have been unreasonable to ask that he should have referred to the specifically Christian doctrine of the Incarnation Yet, could he have done so, he might have found just the illustration that his readers needed." (p. 246.)

Mr. Lofthouse is here conceding a great deal, but even this needs further qualification. When we remember that Bradley denies personality to the Absolute, as well as creativity and redemptive power, it is difficult to see how he is even pointing toward the Christian conception. Moreover, the Absolute knows no distinctions of good and evil. They, too, belong to the realm of appearance (though appearance is not to be equated with illusion in Bradley's system).

It may be relevant to ask, in concluding, why Bradley's "world has come to an end," and why this neo-Hegelianism has so little persuasive power today. It is surely not alone due to the enormous social and scientific changes in the last decades, as Mr. Lofthouse intimates at the close. He suggests, incidentally, and in another connection, a more profound reason when he writes: "And justice to its (the universe's) concrete nature can only be done when we summon to its testimony, as Bradley, we must confess, seemed often loath to do, the scientific investigator, the artist, and the saint." (p. 108.)

Lest these strictures persuade the reader that he should ignore this work, let me hasten to add that Mr. Lofthouse has written an enlightening book which deserves a wide hearing. There will doubtless be those who find his attempted reconciliation of Christianity and Bradleyan idealism more convincing than I do. For his clear exposition of Bradley's difficult ideas, I predict that most readers will be, as this one is, very grateful.

J. GLENN GRAY

Professor of Philosophy, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

A Free Man's Faith: A Philosophy of Life for a Turbulent Age. By D. LUTHER EVANS. New York: Oxford University Press, 1949. pp. x-194. \$3.00.

Between the two World Wars, Professor J. A. Leighton headed the Department of Philosophy at Ohio State University, where he ably defended, in lectures and in important published essays and books, a liberal philosophical interpretation of Christian doctrine. Under the direction of this stalwart liberal, Professor D. Luther Evans wrote his doctor's dissertation. The ablest of Professor Leighton's disciples, he now holds a position as Professor of Philosophy at Ohio State University, where he is admirably succeeding in carrying on the work of his distinguished teacher.

A Free Man's Faith is an excellent product of Professor Evans' thinking. In it he shows himself to be the happy warrior that every man who writes should wish to be. The author picks his way cautiously but safely through the errors of naturalistic humanism and those of neo-orthodox Barthian theology, both of which

are making definite inroads on a genuinely liberal theistic philosophy. Humanism overworks reflective intelligence or reason, whereas neo-orthodoxy overworks revelation and faith. Scientific dogmatism is the end result of the former, and theological obscurantism of the latter. Professor Evans rightly insists that a liberal philosophy of life must be a synthesis of critical reflection and enlightened faith. He issues a clarion call to all earnest seekers after truth to give their undivided and continued support to the eternal verity of the Logos doctrine in its Christian form, as set forth in the Johannine writings, and in the classical systems of metaphysical idealism, especially as presented by Professors J. A. Leighton and Josiah Royce. He makes a valiant effort to prove that this turbulent age needs especially a rejuvenation of faith in the Christ of the Fourth Gospel, who is the eternal Logos immanent in nature, yet transcendent and effulgent in the realm of divinity.

On every page there are valuable ideas a minister could utilize effectively in his sermonizing. The book is exceptionally well-written. It is intended for the general reader rather than for those who are equipped with a technical knowledge of philosophy. Here are the chapter headings: Realities of Idealism, With Wisdom and Understanding, In the Divine Image, Life at Its Best, Heaven on Earth, Lord of All Being.

Professor Evans is probably overly enthusiastic about a plan to create a United Religions Organization similar to the United Nations, which he proposes and designates U. R. (see pp. 151-156). UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization—represents an organized effort to bring about international co-operation in the realms of education, science, and culture generally; and, no doubt, religion would have been specifically included had the framers of the Charter of the United Nations thought this to be feasible. The Amsterdam Conference in 1948 proved that it is impossible to organize all Protestant and all Catholic sects into a World Council of Churches, since there were numerous dissenter groups. How much more difficult it would be to create an effective organization for the co-operation of Moslem, Christian, Hindu, and Buddhist sects, not to mention the various cults! The idea of a United Religions Organization doubtless belongs with those ideas that are destined to come into their own not in the here and now but, if ever, at least a thousand years from now. Certainly men need such ideas to serve them as ideals. No doubt Professor Evans realizes that these ideals will surely become ineffective and wither away if they are not presented and defended with enthusiasm.

DANIEL S. ROBINSON

Director of the School of Philosophy, University of Southern California, Los Angeles 7, California.

Science and Cosmic Purpose. By KELVIN VAN NUYS. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. pp. 256. \$3.00.

This volume, by a member of the department of philosophy in Long Island University, is an attempt at a new theodicy based upon process philosophy. Sensitive to Bertrand Russell's and C. E. M. Joad's criticisms of the biblical God-concept, the author attempts to meet these criticisms in terms of a value-theory based upon Whitehead, Dewey, and other contemporary philosophers. Good, for Van Nuys, must be defined in dynamic rather than static terms. "Good must be conceived rather as consisting in the transition from conditions of tension and disorder toward

conditions of relative resolution and order, in which transition inhere feelings of dissatisfaction changing to satisfaction" (p. 20). This conception of good, drawn primarily from Whitehead and Dewey, is dynamic and behavioral. According to this view, goodness requires as precondition, a situation of tension and dissatisfaction gradually being replaced by resolution and satisfaction. If goodness requires evil—tension and dissatisfaction—as its necessary precondition, then without evil there could be no emerging goodness. Even the evils which appear absolute may serve, in Van Nuys' thought, some more ultimate good than we can understand at the moment.

Evil, then, is not something static. It consists in situations which involve tensions and dissatisfactions. Good likewise is dynamic. It consists in the transformation of such tensional and unsatisfactory situations into their opposites. From this point of view, a world without evil would be a world without good. All arguments, therefore, which seek to prove the nonexistence of God because of the existence of evil are vitiated by this conception of good and its preconditions.

This is a stimulating book which will enrich the thinking of those fortunate enough to read it. Certain questions, however, appear to be in order. In the first place, it must be observed that the conception of value presented in this book does not necessarily imply the conception of God which Van Nuys seeks to support. This view of goodness is basic to the conceptions of God found in the writings of Whitehead, Smuts, Meland, Overstreet, and many others. If Van Nuys has turned the edge of Joad's and Russell's criticisms, he has by no means done the same with the criticisms of traditional conceptions of God which may be found in the writings of those who may be grouped as "absolute immanentists."

In the next place, it may be granted that meaningfulness at the cosmic level might support meaningfulness at the human level. At the same time, it must be remembered that one can find purpose in the universe without finding universal purpose. It follows, therefore, that human life can be meaningful in terms of Van Nuys' theory of value without adopting his conception of God.

Finally, Van Nuys insists that value is prior to existence; that existence arises out of value. This is denied, of course, by the philosophical existentialists. The basis of Van Nuys' argument that value precedes existence appears to be a fundamental distrust of the organic process upon which he rests most of his case.

WILLIAM H. BERNHARDT

The Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colorado.

Hindu View of Christ. By SWAMI AKHILANANDA. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1949. pp. 291. \$3.00.

However early it was—perhaps nineteen hundred years ago, for there are some "Thomas" Christians down Madras-way—that some Hindus first learned of Christ, India's subsequent acquaintance with Christianity has been recognized by various responses, even as Christianity has been variously represented by its own adherents. But the Hindu is accustomed to variety, even to unreconciled contradiction, for he holds generally and tolerantly the view that all things fit ultimately into an idealistic Unity. He can find a place for Christ in such a view.

This book, to be understood, must be read in such an atmosphere, for it deals with more than its bare title indicates. It may be read with sympathy for the ends the author seeks, the high objectives he expounds on behalf of man's

devotion. Nevertheless, the book is Hindu in pattern and limitation, and even tends to limit its own view of Christ. The method of the pattern's weaving is peculiar. Each of the book's ten chapters, except the third, is introduced by New Testament quotations; but the rest of the three hundred and eleven references from here and there bear the real burden of discussion and carry the volume far beyond its title. The one chapter without its Bible text is that on "Christ, a Yogi," and its text is from the *Gita*. Indeed, the volume's central theme springs from the *Gita*, and Christ himself is viewed in *Gita* terms.

That is, "there have been numerous incarnations (*avatars*) in the history of the world, of whom Jesus was one," says the author (p. 21), after having quoted previously the *Gita's* words that "whenever there is decline of Dharma (religion) and the rise of Adharma (evil), then I body Myself forth." The "Myself" (note the capitalization here and elsewhere) refers, of course, to Krishna in whom Vishnu "bodied" himself forth. He, Krishna, is the God of the *Gita*, as Christ is in the Hindu view God of the New Testament. Neither, in the author's view, is to be taken as the *only* incarnation. The author objects, therefore, to the orthodox Christian's view of Christ. Indeed, he himself is a Hindu in a restricted sense, being of the modern Ramakrishna school of Vedanta which qualifies theistically (*cf.* incarnation and devotion) the monistic idealism of Vedanta. And he sees competition ahead for Christian missions when "the Vedanta movement" itself "becomes a more aggressive missionary movement" (p. 275). But maybe his movement would convert the West, for is the swami, in fact, a missionary to the West?

This book of his, however, expounds no such gospel, nor is it a volume for the common man, whatever his religion. It does sound a "practical" note through its suggestion of the "spiritual exercises of yogism" (*cf.* the index), but indulges much in the idealistic. And the educated reader may find fault with the swami for his indefinite and incomplete references to technicalities by which religion must be weighed, or by which religions must be compared. He has not made convincing use of, for example, *bhakti*, *yoga*, *karma* (no Hindu can dispense with this), *samadhi* and the *samskaras*; and his "brotherhood" also, after all, is something quite abstract.

What is it, then, that the swami would teach the West, both "laborers" and others (*cf.* pp. 129, 146)? He finds Christ to be an incarnation, an oriental, a yogi—if only we would learn *yoga's* proper meaning (p. 73), for Christ himself wanted his followers "to go through [yogic] practices" (pp. 116, 118, 126). He would not convert non-Hindus, but would have them "share" in true religion as he expounds it (*cf.* pp. 246-7, 282). Christianity and Hinduism, he finds, have, for example, "grace" to share. For all religions awareness of God should be the main objective (p. 146). The last chapter, entitled "Christian Missions," affords evidence that one theme runs throughout the book—a sharing toward one objective. The work, however, is often repetitious, sometimes padded, vague, as has been said, in its use of terms (but one may be reminded that Hinduism, with no regard for dogmatic creed, allows terms to be freely used); its analogies are often arbitrary and far-fetched (*cf.* p. 223), and it contains one tale that is absurd (p. 190). If the author now and then seems credulous (*cf.* pp. 82f.), he never seems insincere. He finds a place for Christ and Christianity (p. 43), but is intent upon experiment with Truth—although he either seems to miss it or else not to make it clear. It is not Christ who is expounded, even in the Hindu view, but *religion* as the Hindu views it. Nevertheless, the book is worthy of a sympathetic reading.

It may be recommended to all sincere seekers of the truth. One may enjoy the volume even while he judges it. Perhaps the work is lacking most in the realism of religion.

JOHN CLARK ARCHER

Professor of Comparative Religion, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

The Small Sects in America: Their Historical, Theological and Psychological Backgrounds. By ELMER T. CLARK. New York: The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949. pp. 256. \$3.00.

This is a completely revised and enlarged edition of an authoritative and indispensable study of one of the most significant social and religious aspects of American life: past, present, and apparently future. It is just as well that this review is limited to 500 words. Otherwise, it would become a transcription of the book itself. "Sect" is used with its dispassionate dictionary meanings—uncolored by pride or prejudice. Webster notes that it is derived from *sequi*, to follow, and should not be confused with *secare*, to cut—which makes a difference.

Eight chapters clarify and, as far as possible, organize a bewildering and fluid complexity of religious beliefs and practices, under their creative quests and loyalties. The first chapter examines and seeks to explain the sectarian spirit in American religious life. The chapters which follow classify the sects as (1) pessimistic or Adventist, (2) perfectionist or subjective, (3) charismatic or Pentecostal, (4) communistic, (5) loyalistic or objective. Finally, the general characteristics of the small sects are described. New-thought bodies and mystical bodies are considered in the appendices. The bibliography is inclusive, the indices entirely adequate.

Within these spacious frames there is an amazing wealth of factual content, observation, and interpretative insight. For factual content there are six double-column, fine-print index pages to list such religious bodies in the United States, every one of which is considered in the text. This gives the book an invaluable and encyclopedic quality. But it is blessedly free from encyclopedic dust. The author's own experiences brighten its pages. (For example, a visit which he paid to a session of the House of Prayer, where he was a guest of honor.) The book itself is wise and vivid, with interpretative insight.

These "sects" are not sects at all. The word is entirely inadequate. They are, in their entirety, a living tissue; they are loneliness seeking comradeship; poverty seeking a refuge; the dispossessed seeking something of their own; the stained seeking cleansing; the confused seeking some meaning for the mystery of life and some escape from their frustrations. They are loyalties seeking leadership and the emotionally starved seeking holy excitement. They are the folk of Tobacco Road and smoke-dimmed city streets seeking escape from drab monotones. They are a testimony to the timeless appeal of religion and the power and urge of it to find channeled ways. They are seamed with old, old inheritances and racial tensions. They have come across the ocean with the immigrant—or been almost spontaneously fostered on American soil. Among other things, they testify to the incurable interest of simple minds in religious mysteries.

Incidentally, the index is a revelation of unbridled ingenuity in nomenclature. One would not think these names could even be imagined.

This is a "must" book for all religious and educational leaders and students of our American social order. And it is, in a way, a sad and sobering book.

Wh
that
thes
prol
coul
whi
GAI

The
Mor

of E
have
their
cent
out
of t
gosp

are
I. "
Chap
sonal
volu
tions
Prea
and

Earl
duct.
of a
mora
of th
"wor
healt
fana
Rule

the t
danc
did h
her p
ward
I wo
make

What have we done, or left undone, to bring all this about? Dr. Clark confesses that his statistics are inadequate. He does note that the percentage growth of these prolific groups exceeds that of the great churches. Except for the fact that such proliferations have characterized American life from the colonial period, one could conclude that the spiritual fabric of the United States is coming undone—which does not augur well.

GAIUS GLENN ATKINS

38 East Beech Street, Long Beach, New York.

The Early Methodist People. By LESLIE F. CHURCH. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1949. (Epworth, 1948.) pp. viii-286. \$4.75.

More About the Early Methodist People. By LESLIE F. CHURCH. London: The Epworth Press, 1949. pp. 324. 12/6.

This long overdue history of the Methodist people, by a competent scholar of English Methodist origins, fills a big gap on our Methodist History shelves. We have long had before us the detailed journals and biographies of the Wesleys and their collaborators, the "big guns" of the religious movement that changed eighteenth-century England. These two fascinating volumes by Dr. Church, which grew out of his Fernley-Hartley Lecture for 1948, take us into the homes and hearts of the average eighteenth-century Methodists, to show us what effect Wesley's gospel had upon their lives, their families, and their communities.

Dr. Church's two volumes, though not labeled "Volume I" and "Volume II," are clearly parts of one work. The first volume contains the following chapters: I. "Wesley's Ideal Methodist and the Reality," II. "The Homeless and Their Chapel-Building," III. "Their Spiritual Experience," IV. "Fellowship," V. "Personal Conduct," and VI. "Their Family Life and Their Children." The second volume takes up the remaining subjects: I. "Their Social Relationships, Occupations, and Literacy," II. "Persecution and Triumph," III. "The First Local Preachers," IV. "Women Preachers," V. "Their First Venture in Social Service," and VI. "Worship—Public and Private."

One of the most interesting of Dr. Church's chapters is Chapter V in *The Early Methodist People*, on the much-debated subject of Methodist "Personal Conduct." Were Wesley's *Rules*, as many of his critics have charged, the outgrowth of a fantastic and unhealthy piety? The author makes it plain that the austere moral standards of early Methodism (shared, to be sure, with other religious groups of the time) were a natural reaction to the lax morality of the eighteenth-century "world," and that the "pietistic excesses gradually adjusted themselves to the healthy Christian norm." Although some of his followers undoubtedly went to fanatic extremes, Wesley's own common sense and moderation in interpreting his *Rules* shines through this chapter like the morning sun.

Take the theater, for instance. As Dr. Church points out, Wesley censured the theater of his day, but condemned neither plays nor theater reading. And even dancing was not categorically condemned by Father Wesley, remembering as he did how his good mother had engaged a dancing-master to teach the children in her presence in the Epworth Rectory. And remembering, too, the social awkwardness of some of his preachers, Wesley himself wrote, "If I had convenience, I would be glad to have all our preachers taught, even by a dancing-master, to make a bow and to go in and out of a room." And again, "I am convinced that

true religion or holiness cannot be without cheerfulness . . . and that true religion has nothing sour, austere, unsociable, unfriendly in it."

The chapter on the family life of the early Methodists gives us an attractive picture. Wesley made some mistakes on child psychology, as seen in his harsh rules for the Kingswood School, but here he shared the faults of his century. It is significant that children were always drawn to the father of Methodism. In his advanced years he rode in a yellow chaise, and one of his contemporaries recalled that he "used to order his carriage half an hour before he wanted it himself, so that the children might have a few minutes' ride, 'as many at a time as the coach would hold.'" And particularly revealing are the passages from the life of Mrs. Hester Ann Rogers, telling of a visit with her husband to the conference at Bristol. She hardly mentions conference affairs in her journal—her thoughts were on her three sons, then studying at Kingswood. This and countless other passages show the deep humanity which constantly peeps out through the plain clothes and austere morality of the early Methodist people.

In the sweep of these two volumes, thoroughly documented and reading as interestingly as copious use of original source material can make the story, we see passing before us the common people in "Mr. Wesley's Societies." There were characters like Silas Told, the ex-slaver of Bristol who became the master of Wesley's Charity School; and at the opposite end of the social scale, Lady Mary Fitzgerald, an attendant at the Court of George III, where she influenced many people by her quiet, saintly life. Since the early Methodists were "no respecters of persons," farmers and shopkeepers, artisans and soldiers, doctors and teachers, the lowly and the titled were found on Methodist classbooks. "Who shall say," writes the author, "that Methodism went to this social group or that? Its concern was first with the need of man's restless soul, and with the proclamation of God's unchanging love."

Drawn from countless journals and autobiographies of first- and second-generation English Methodists, these volumes are the history of the common people swept into the movement, rather than the familiar story of the outward and institutional history of Methodism or the lives of its principal leaders. "Grass-roots history," we call it in America. And one cannot lay these volumes down without the realization that there is need for a volume on similar lines dealing with the rank and file of early American Methodism.

DON YODER

Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

Best Sermons: 1949-50 Edition. Edited by G. PAUL BUTLER. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. pp. xxii-325. \$3.00.

An unlettered man, asked his opinion of a dictionary, is said to have replied that he thought it a very fine book except that it changed the subject so often. The reviewer of a volume containing fifty-two different sermons by as many separate authors is tempted to echo that sentiment!

Actually, the wide variety of authorship in Dr. Butler's most recent volume of *Best Sermons* is one of its most attractive features. The diversity of authors—Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish—shows itself chiefly in style and point of view. The sermons deal with many different subjects, but a common theme underlies them all. The authors are concerned with human life and its significance

in the light of their faith in God. Each one deals with that aspect of life's infinite variety that engages his interest and attention at the moment, but his ultimate concern is with life as men must live it in the middle of the twentieth century.

The true function of a sermon is to be heard and considered in the fellowship of a worshiping congregation. Much is lost when a written sermon is read in silence and solitude—much, but not all. Sermons should be read so that the insights of their authors will stimulate our own. Only sick minds feel no need of the stimulus of other minds. Who would not covet the privilege of a quiet interview with sincere, devoted, and competent ministers, priests, and rabbis throughout the English-speaking world, to ask them what they see when they look at life through the eyes of their faith?

By reading 6,585 sermons in order to publish the fifty-two "best," Dr. Butler has brought such a privilege within the reach of all of us. The reader will have revealing glimpses not only into the minds of men whose names are familiar, but also into the minds of a younger generation of preachers as yet unknown to fame. Some of them have taken their ordination vows since the Second World War, and more than one speaks out of firsthand experience of peril and persecution associated with that conflict. These sermons, coming as they do from such variant sources, nevertheless reveal how much there is that men of divergent views cherish in common. No one will agree with all that he reads here. What of it? His mind will be quickened, his outlook broadened, and his confidence in the relevance of religion to life will be renewed.

CECIL FREDERICK RISTOW

Minister, University Methodist Temple, Seattle, Washington.

The Reality of the Religious Life. By HENRY BETT. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949. pp. 160. \$2.25.

Does prayer ever affect the weather? Can a man who takes fully into account the discoveries of science and philosophy believe that miracles happen or ever did happen? Is there a divine providence which uses and overrules the purposes of men?

Many people in our day quickly answer all such questions in the negative. In so doing, they are actually dismissing essential elements of faith without which religion cannot long endure. So contends the English Methodist minister and educator, Henry Bett, in introducing a thoughtful and searching study of supernatural elements in the Christian religion.

Most of the book is devoted to clearing away objections commonly urged against belief in miracles. If weather and disease are under the rigid rule of law, how, it is demanded, can they be affected by prayer? If the meteorological conditions are such as to bring rain, rain will come, with or without the prayerful appeals of men. If the conditions are not right, rain will not come, though crops are destroyed and men desperately beseech God for relief.

To all such arguments Bett makes answer by an analysis of causal law and by noting the limitations of our knowledge concerning the formulas by which God determines his governance of nature. Miracles are not, he maintains, violations of God's laws; they are violations of our partial formulations of those laws. Thus a miracle of one age becomes an example of orderly law when a later generation has learned more about the ways of God through further scientific

study. Yet there is no reason to believe that God has placed himself in such a rigid framework that he is bound and helpless in the universe which he has made.

The author has probably exaggerated somewhat the place of miracle and special providence in religion. Some real religion seems to endure and produce important effects when belief in these has been discarded. Yet, for most people, prayer of repentance, praise, thanksgiving, and communion would soon lose vitality if all prayers of petition, save the seeking of subjective effects, were to cease. And when vital prayer is gone, real religion is gone.

Mr. Bett has not made it quite clear why miracles, as he defines them, should be called supernatural. His argument and examples seem to imply that they could be rightly called supernatural only if we meant to exclude from the natural those aspects of nature which are not accurately understood by the persons to whom the events seem miraculous. His able defense of the supreme biblical miracles, the resurrection and the redemptive work of Christ, would have been more convincing if he had candidly admitted the presence of myth and legend in many of the lesser miracle stories.

The best feature of the book is the patient removal of many naturalistic prejudices which, in the minds of some persons, have limited quite needlessly the belief in God's availability to answer prayer and care for his children. It is a book to open the mind and heighten faith.

L. HAROLD DEWOLF

Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Massachusetts.

The Ministry. Edited by J. RICHARD SPANN. New York: The Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949. pp. 208. \$2.00.

This book is about the minister as well as the ministry. When one has finished reading it, his conviction is confirmed that the ministry remains the impossible calling. This is due in part to one's being overwhelmed by all of the things a minister must do. Poise and power come only when one's major concern is what the minister must *be*. Then does the full impact of Jesus' faith that "with men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible" become a radiant reality.

Wordsworth's poignant question comes frequently to the reader's mind,

"Who is he

That every man . . . should wish to be?"

One satisfactory answer comes from Joseph R. Sizoo, who discusses "His Preparation." "If a minister is to be worthy of his calling, if he is to stand unashamed and unafraid, he must be a man of conviction, compassion, and character—thinking clearly, feeling deeply, and living nobly."

The Ministry is a symposium to which eighteen different persons contributed and which has been carefully edited by J. Richard Spann, Director of Ministerial Training for The Methodist Church. Each chapter in the book was originally delivered as a part of the Annual Conference on Ministerial Training, and it is a tribute to the skillful editing by Dr. Spann that most of the chapters create within the reader the sensation of hearing them delivered. This is especially true of the final chapter, "His Higher Compensations," by Raimundo de Ovies. As one reads this chapter the author suddenly becomes a brother minister, who, from the wealth of his fifty years' experience, is radiating some of his joy and his concerns,

his humor and his wisdom, his humility and his power to fellow-servants in Christ.

Major issues are discussed in this book. Bishop Kern emphasizes a "glowing sense of the mystery of personal redemption" as the first qualification of a minister. Henry Sloane Coffin's interpretation of the call is at once simple and sound. He retains the mystery while illuminating the meaning of this divine-human interaction. The various backgrounds from which ministers come are presented by Murray H. Leiffer, whose exacting studies validate his observations. Russell Henry Stafford says that evangelism, the minister's supreme task, "consists in bringing people by all means available into acquaintance for themselves with the Jesus of the Gospels, whom we already know, so that the very purpose of our living is to spill over our joy in that knowledge into other lives."

The work of the ministry is presented by men whose achievements give authority to their words. Ralph W. Sockman's chapter on the minister as preacher is one of the finest in print. "Preaching," he insists, "is discourse developed from divine revelation and designed to move men through and toward the divine will." The theme of the minister as prophet, priest, and comforter is developed with fidelity and skill by Oscar Thomas Olson. Otis R. Rice shares his curative experiences as a hospital chaplain so as to make them applicable to the pastoral ministry. Harold F. Carr makes religious education a really inspiring function of the ministry.

Having conceived the chief problem of any local church as its leadership, both ministerial and lay, Weldon Crossland then proceeds to characterize the minister as leader of people and program. Bishop A. Frank Smith recognizes the importance of the minister's work as director of public relations.

The minister is first of all a person; and Seward Hiltner brings sane and helpful counsel on the minister's psychosomatic health. Nolan B. Harmon has for many years been clarifying the minister's professional ethics, and his chapter throws valuable light upon this important subject. He makes definite suggestions on specific issues, but his general principle is most significant: "good sense and Christian brotherliness transcend all ceremonial, and as a general rule it is far better to be kind than to be correct."

"One of the truly shocking facts about our present-day ministry," affirms D. Elton Trueblood, "is the way in which so many ministers are living lives of personal frustration. The physicians of souls are lamentably unable to heal themselves." Trueblood is convinced that "much of the trouble lies in an almost constant conflict between the average minister's idealizations of his own job and the actual life he leads." He then makes some determinative observations and suggestions on the study habits of ministers.

One of the major limitations of the book is its inadequate discussion of modern methods of testing for vocational guidance. There is likewise a need for pursuing more thoroughly the relationship which exists and/or should exist between the church and the seminaries in recruiting, selecting, training, "screening," and conference relations. Also, one often wonders why a book with so much usable material does not have an index.

Every minister will want to read this book for his own soul's sake, and he will find many opportunities to use its contents among his parishioners who are contemplating the ministry.

SAM HEDRICK

Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Massachusetts.

The Church's Ministry. By T. W. MANSON. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1949. pp. 110. \$2.00.

Questions of religion, like any other questions, are subject to rational determination, or else they are completely insoluble. The nature of the apostolic ministry, e.g., is not to be settled by ecclesiastical authority, but by historical investigation and logical deduction.

When the Bishop of Oxford and a group of distinguished Anglican scholars, therefore, issue a pronouncement regarding apostolic succession it does not necessarily mean that the last word has been spoken and the issue settled. This pronouncement itself is subject to the criticism of historical scholarship and logic, which Professor T. W. Manson brings against it most effectively in his little volume, *The Church's Ministry*.

Dr. Manson is Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in the University of Manchester, and in his student days won First Class Honors in Philosophy at the University of Glasgow, and in Oriental Languages later at Cambridge. So he is well qualified to deal with the problems involved in the question of the nature of the church's ministry.

To begin with, he contends that if the church is the Body of Christ, its only essential and constitutive ministry is that of Christ himself as its living Head, and all others are dependent, derivative, and functional. In other words, neither the church itself, nor anyone in the church, takes the place of Christ, but the church itself is simply the human instrument for carrying on his continued ministry. And his ministry in its essence is one of service. "In the Kingdom of God, service is not a stepping-stone to nobility; it is nobility, the only kind of nobility that is recognized." "In the Kingdom of God, God is King; and all others, the Messiah included, are his servants." "The ministry of Jesus is the Kingdom of God spelled out in human terms."

Next, Professor Manson treats of the nature of the Apostolate by considering the meaning of the Hebrew equivalent of *apostle*, the *shaliach*. The most important implications here are that the commission of the *shaliach* is not transferable and that the term designates not a status but a function—which is also true of the essential meaning of the term "apostle" in the New Testament. He then traces the historic development of the settled ministry in the early church, and finally argues that the test of the apostolic character of nonepiscopal ministries is the same as that for episcopal, namely, whether they are accompanied by "the signs of an apostle," since the true apostolic succession is not in any particular form of ordination but in the church itself as the Body of Christ.

His conclusion is that the unity of the church both transcends and defies its apparent divisions, and that the two conflicting approaches to the church and its ministry can be reconciled in the recognition of Christ as its Head.

Professor Manson is an able champion of evangelical Protestantism; but his continued emphasis on the church as the Body of Christ causes me to recall with even greater appreciation a warning of Professor Berkelbach van der Sprenkel of Utrecht that one should not press biological analogies too far.

JOHN HENDERSON POWELL, JR.

Minister of the Reformed Church of Bronxville, New York.

The Human Venture in Sex, Love, and Marriage. By PETER A. BERTOCCHI.
New York: Haddam House (Association Press), 1949. pp. 143. \$2.50.

When Professor Kinsey made public his now famous report on the sexual behavior of American men, his approach was strictly behavioristic in the sense that his findings were purely quantitative. A study dealing with the sexual behavior of American rats would not have been essentially different. Undoubtedly it would be possible to observe with some accuracy exactly how many physical matings take place in a given time between a given number of animals. The important thing to say about this kind of study is that it omits nearly all the most important questions so far as human beings are concerned.

Now Professor Bertocchi, of Boston University, has undertaken to deal with some of the really important questions in regard to sexual experience. He begins by dealing with men and women as *human* beings and therefore dealing with values. He seeks to answer some of the questions which are necessarily asked by parents and other counselors of young people who would like to counsel wisely. The book is concerned with what expressions of sexual experience will most contribute to the good life. Accordingly the book must be catalogued as moral philosophy rather than popular psychology or biology. The author knows that he is dealing with controversial or even dangerous issues, but he faces them boldly.

Central to Professor Bertocchi's philosophy is the contention that the convenient distinction between facts and values constitutes a false dichotomy. Values, he says, are part of the facts, and facts we dare not ignore, if we propose to face the world realistically. It is undoubtedly good to know the facts, some of which the Kinsey reporters have given us; but "the *qualitative values* of sex and love are also facts," writes Bertocchi, "and their significance in human life is not determined by the number of people who are satisfying their sexual desires a certain number of times through certain patterns of behavior."

The author's complaint is that scientific data and careful moralizing are so seldom brought together. Data without principles are meaningless, and principles without data are abstract. The present volume is a modest effort to conjoin these two facts in the total situation, since the author is at once a reflective thinker and a counselor of many years' standing with whom young people have shared their experiences.

The strongest part of the book is the analysis of the situation of young lovers before marriage and the consequential case for premarital abstinence. In this study the author strengthens his argument by his continued insistence that real love, though it includes the desire for physical coition, must always include much more than this, in order for the coition itself to be really good. The author always reminds us that he is dealing with *persons*, and persons have other needs in addition to the purely biological ones. When two young people decide to throw hallowed standards to one side and gratify their desires, Professor Bertocchi asks them *which* desires they propose to gratify. What about their social interests, their self-respect, their responsibilities?

Never once, so far as I can see, does the author refer to sexual union in any ascetic way. Sex, he holds, is good, and sexual joy can be very good. He warns against its premature expression or too frequent expression, not because he doubts its goodness for men and women, but because he wants it to be *truly* good. He wants us to be wise in our management of human life. This is what I should call

genuine realism in regard to the problem of sex. The naturalistic revolt against prudery was a necessary phase in which many have belatedly remained, but it is as unrealistic as the Puritanism against which it revolts if it glorifies biological factors at the expense of others. On the mere basis of pleasure, which is more to be envied: the married man who is completely loyal to one loyal woman on whom his affection is intensely centered, or the philanderer?

I don't know whether Professor Bertocci's thesis will convince the young persons, but it ought to convince those to whom they come for help.

ELTON TRUEBLOOD

Professor of Philosophy, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana.

Punishment Without Crime. By S. ANDHIL FINEBERG. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1949. pp. xii-337. \$3.50.

Here is a unique and long-needed book on racial prejudice and what you and I can do about it. There have been many recent attempts to analyze the causes, the types, and the consequences of intolerance. Their tendency has been to make us more than ever aware of the seriousness of our predicament, the scope and depth and persistence of the misunderstandings and fears and suspicions that threaten to overwhelm us and our treasured ideals of brotherhood and of democracy.

Of such facts we sorely need to be reminded. But we need as urgently the encouragement this book brings. For it tells us what people like ourselves, caught as we are in the pattern of discrimination, have managed to do about it. Every chapter is packed with simple, vivid, and convincing illustrations. Yet, because these are real illustrations, the appeal is to immediately useful common-sense action rather than to basic or revolutionary endeavor. Its strategy is one of reasonableness, not of wide-eyed idealism; of small, well-planned advances all along the line, not of the single sweeping attack for final victory.

Although Dr. Fineberg has in his earlier books been concerned almost exclusively with the American Jew and with anti-Semitism, he has here presented the whole range of minority group problems and has offered counsel for action both to minority and majority group members. Thus his book treats of the entire conflict, including every principal battle area and the chief contestants. It is addressed to all Americans who believe in democracy and brotherhood in the confident assurance that in spite of hate-mongers, rabble-rousers, the frustrated and the self-doubters, the democratic way of life will at last prevail—the confidence that men and women of good will in every land will join forces against injustice and prejudice. "Our fate—as individuals and nations—in the coming years depends in large part," he says, "upon our leadership, upon our attitude toward change, upon the spirit with which the favored and the dispossessed meet and deal with each other."

This book is not nor does it pretend to be a thorough analysis of the psychological and sociological factors involved in prejudice and its eradication. However, it is fair to criticize it as underestimating the extent to which prejudice is the product of our social and economic structure, within which is to be found the conflict that cut-throat competition brings, the insecurity and the frustration which lead to aggression especially against those least able in their own defense. Also its effectiveness is lessened by the absence of a bibliography and an index; the latter is made doubly essential by the rather loose organization of material, so much of which

would be of greater practical value if those facing similar difficulties could readily lay their hands upon it.

But these are slight faults indeed when measured against the fine practicality and sound enheartenment of this book.

ARTHUR L. SWIFT, JR.

Professor of Church and Community, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Man Born to Be King. By DOROTHY L. SAYERS. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. pp. x-339. \$3.75.

Dorothy Sayers is a good writer who has not confined her talents to one kind of book. But whether she is writing detective novels, essays, or plays, she is a sound craftsman; the plan, construction, and development of her ideas proceed both imaginatively and rationally. Her prose is always good, and sometimes superior. There is no mystery story to my knowledge which can compare with *The Nine Tailors*; and her others are second only to it. When she moves to different kinds of work, she takes with her the same sound sense of cause and effect, of the importance of character and human nature, of the fallibility and indomitableness of man.

Her newest book is an ambitious one; it is a series of radio plays on the life of Christ. They have been written with full consciousness of the magnitude of the project and the difficulties of its presentation. But Miss Sayers is a Christian and a scholar, as well as a good playwright, and she has achieved something worth listening to. It is unfair, of course, to judge drama purely from the printed page; this is especially true of broadcast drama, where the intimate intonations of voices, and all manner of sound effects, can be so cleverly projected to produce illusions of reality that Jesus seems to speak no farther away than the next chair. The eyes of our minds, perhaps, are still too accustomed in reading a play to project before us the scope of a proscenium, with colors, lights, and movements. The little voice of the radio at the ear is something else again, and the reading and appreciation of plays designed for it is a special technique. It seems to me, however, that Miss Sayers has mastered the fretful art of writing for radio, and that, well and sympathetically produced, these plays could be extraordinarily effective.

Their limitations are apparent in the book's pages. They are the limitations inherent in any contemporary rendering of a timeless story—limitations of the author and the language, both creatures of their time. The approach of the author is limited by the theological ideas of the day and of the individual; Miss Sayers is influenced—and confined—by conformity to the creeds, and by contemporary emphasis upon the historical aspects of Christianity. She feels, as she says in the Introduction, that she is dealing with "a piece of recorded history." It is perhaps this emphasis on "determined historical realism" that gives an air of contrivance to the plays, so that the characters and happenings—though taken straight from the New Testament—have often a new and somewhat artificial appearance.

This appearance is heightened by the other limitation, that of language. On the whole the author does well at the impossible task of combining present-day and biblical English; but on the page the speech is often jarring. It may be better *viva voce*. This difficulty, I realize, will exist more for the American than for the English reader. Miss Sayers is using the contemporary speech of England, which she handles very well, employing subtly and carefully distinctions of dialect to

indicate varieties of class and education. But to us it is only startling to hear H's dropped in Jerusalem, and by that much is destroyed the effect which the author wishes to create, namely, that people then were the same as people now.

You will not agree entirely with her presentation of Jesus. But the book is worth reading and studying, if only for the new and sometimes unlikely angles from which we see the life of Christ. What it attempts is probably not wholly possible; but this new version is ambitious, careful, interesting.

JOSEPHINE YOUNG CASE

Colgate University, Hamilton, New York.

The Atoning Life. By HENRY SYLVESTER NASH. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. pp. xii-112. \$1.00.

Christ's Victory and Ours. By FREDERICK C. GRANT. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. pp. 85. \$2.00.

It is never possible, due to our printing schedule, for RELIGION IN LIFE to give books published for the current Lenten season the attention and space that is their due, in time to be of much use to our readers. However, the best of them are not "dated" or confined to the present season.

This is especially true of Dr. Nash's *The Atoning Life*. While it was chosen as the Presiding Bishop's Book for Lent 1950, it is a reprint, and was first published in 1908. Bishop Sherrill finds it "as modern as this minute." It stresses the individual Christian's vocation to live with his Master "the atoning life," not by separating himself from the world, but ever more deeply concerned with his fellows; "he cannot pretend to know Christ, and dream himself into some little heaven." At a time when, we are told, the prevailing attitude toward history was an unrealistic optimism, Dr. Nash looked at history and saw "rising out of its depths, as the seer in the Book of Daniel saw them, one form after another, half human and half brute, visions of world empire and world trade. Man is a wolf to man." In such a world, "the joy of those who break bread in the Kingdom of God is inseparable from redemptive pain."

The other book, *Christ's Victory and Ours*, by Professor Grant, is subtitled "A Book for Good Friday and Easter." He movingly combines the approach of the New Testament historian with that of the reverent believer. In an introductory chapter, "Why Did Jesus Die?" he holds that the answer given by the early church could hardly be much different from that given by Jesus himself; primarily, obedience to the will of God as revealed in Scripture and in contemporary events. He then writes on each of the Seven Words, and shows how the victory was won *through* the cross. In the final Easter chapter, he states that, far from being a "Jewish ethical movement now freshly decked out and disguised as a pagan cult of a dying-rising Savior God," Christianity *began* with the faith that Jesus was raised from the dead—witness the early chapters of Acts, whose language is not that of later Hellenized Christology or even that of Paul. There is no one "orthodox, exclusive, mandatory view of the resurrection"; primary is the faith in the vindication of Jesus, God manifest in him, and his ultimate triumph. "For such a faith, there is no death."

ERMINIE H. LANTERO

RELIGION IN LIFE, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

The

anno
print

the in
edited
mind
includ
the b
encyc
every

of the
and c
ing, v
A. Lo
inary.

book-a
the bu

The A
C

T
was cr
Comp
high-so
mediat

T
Edgar
by G.
"Presb
Garriso

T
at \$79.
terms.

Und
ment.
Cokesbu
author,
Testam
consum
Testam
sort has

The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949. 15 volumes. \$4.50 per volume.

The Baker Book House (1019 Wealthy St., S.E., Grand Rapids 6, Michigan) announces that it has secured exclusive rights from Funk and Wagnalls for a reprint edition of *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*.

The new Schaff-Herzog is the only encyclopedia of its kind. It is based on the internationally known German *Realencyklopädie* founded by J. J. Herzog and edited by Albert Hauck. The English edition was prepared under the guiding mind of the famous church historian, Philip Schaff. This encyclopedia not only includes Bible knowledge, but embraces every phase of religious knowledge from the beginning of history. It has long been recognized as the standard religious encyclopedia for libraries, seminaries, Bible schools and colleges, and Bible scholars everywhere.

The new edition will be more than a routine reprint. The thirteen volumes of the original set have been completely redesigned for serviceability, appearance, and convenience. One or two supplementary volumes, in similar form and binding, will bring the set completely up to date. These will be edited by Dr. Lefferts A. Loetscher, Associate Professor of Church History, Princeton Theological Seminary.

The first volume of this new Schaff-Herzog appeared in November, 1949. A book-a-month schedule has been prepared to facilitate the purchase of this set by the buyer of moderate means.

The American People's Encyclopedia. FRANKLIN J. MEINE, Editor-in-chief. Chicago: The Spencer Press, Inc., 153 North Michigan, Avenue, 1949.

This encyclopedia, under the supervisory editorship of Dr. Walter Dill Scott, was created for distribution exclusively in the United States by Sears, Roebuck and Company. It was prepared to meet the needs of the average American adult of high-school education, written in the American idiom, and contains topics of immediate interest, as well as those of classical and academic interest.

The religious topics include the following articles: "New Testament," by Edgar J. Goodspeed; "Old Testament," by William F. Albright; "Methodism," by G. Bromley Oxnam; "Protestant Episcopal Church," by Donald B. Aldrich; "Presbyterianism," by Frederick W. Loetscher; several articles by Winfred E. Garrison.

The encyclopedia is sold in various editions, from the Standard Home Edition at \$79.50 to the Imperial Edition at \$149.50, and all may be purchased on credit terms. The School and Library Edition at \$120.00 is available at a 20% discount.

Understanding the New Testament. By Ian W. Fraser. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.75. A New Zealand author, who has spent many years in New Testament study, has written for popular consumption a book on how the New Testament came to be. A work of this sort has been needed for some time and

is proving popular. *The author was educated in America, though his home and parish are in New Zealand.

A Diary of Private Prayer. By John Baillie. Scribner. \$1.75. John Baillie calls himself "a pilgrim of eternity." These prayers of thankful-

ness and confidence, as they "ponder the pattern life has been weaving," draw us close to the pilgrim, encourage us in our own quest, and reveal the author as one sensitive to eternal truth. Christ-centered, these prayers show a simple and steadfast reliance upon the very present Father.

A Man's Reach. By Glenn Clark. Harper. \$3.00. This autobiography of Glenn Clark, prayer-inspired founder of the "Camps Farthest Out," describes Clark's "levers of prayer," and demonstrates how prayer, "the soul's sincere desire," gave new life to the author and to countless others influenced by the God-centered life.

Women in the New Testament. By Norah Lofts. Macmillan. \$2.50. "Compared with the Old Testament, dynamite is a harmless substance, lightly to be handled." The same must be said of the women of the Bible after viewing their passions, faults, and virtues in these twenty skillfully drawn psychological portraits.

Guiding Children in Christian Growth. By Mary Alice Jones. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.00. Here is an insight into the life of the growing child and a statement of our faith in terms that will help teacher, parent, preacher, and pupil. The book is crowded with practical illustrations of teaching the faith through worship and living at home and in the church.

Missions and the American Mind. By Kenneth Scott Latourette. National Foundation Press, Indianapolis. \$1.00 (cloth), 25¢ (pap.). A historical study showing that "the Christian missionary enterprise has been one of the potent factors shaping the American mind"; an element "by no means dominant; yet it must be reckoned with by anyone who would understand the United States."

Holy Wisdom. By F. Augustine Baker. Harper. \$5.00. A reprint of Father Baker's 300-year-old classic "Directions for the Prayer of Contemplation." "Even today its insights into the nature of the spiritual life can stand beside the best that 'research' has discovered to date."

From Statesman to Philosopher By Walter McIntosh Merrill. Philosophical Library. \$3.50. A study in Bolingbroke's deism; of special interest to students of the eighteenth century, providing background for Pope and Swift, offering "a critical appraisal of the frequently misunderstood doctrines of late deism."

The Holy Imperative. By Winston L. King. Harper. \$2.50. Subtitled "The power of God and the good life." "It is both inevitable and desirable that religion and morality develop separate disciplines," but "neither can fulfill its proper function without the other's ministry." A vigorous study of the current rift between religion and ethics, and the whole problem of Christian morality.

The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Volume II. By Julius A. Bewer. Harper. 75¢ (pap.). Second issue in Harper's Annotated Bible Series, using the King James Version; by Union's well-known emeritus professor of Old Testament.

Time to Spare. By Douglas Steere. Harper. \$2.00. "A practical manual for retreats, containing talks, readings, and general instructions for the three-day spiritual retreat."

St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. By Sir William Ramsay. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich. \$3.50. The first of a series of reprints of the fine reference works, long out of print, by this Scotch archeologist and professor of humanity at Oxford.

Vol.

JOH
ROB
SAM
GERJose
Paul
Earl
W. I
RobSalv
Thir
Tow
"Th
The
A R
Pers
The
Prog
The
The
The
Lloy
A R
Book

Copyr

150 F